Animaduersions vpon LILLIES Grammar, OR LILLY scanned.

An Extract of Grammaticall PROBLEMES.

Of *Grammar*, and the parts thereof.

MAy euery one that teacheth Lillies *Grammar, bee called* Grammaticus *in proprietie of speech?*

No: If he be able to teach those *Rudiments* onely, he is rather to be called *Grammatista?*

What difference is there betweene Grammatista, *and* Grammaticus?

Among the Ancients he was called *Grammaticus*, who did not onely teach how to speake a tongue well,

25867

well, but also did examine, and discusse all the difficulties in Poets, Historians, Orators, Philosophers, &c. hee that taught the Elements of Words, Letters, was called *Grammatista*. *Grammaticus* with them was as much as *Literatus*, a learned Scholar, or Criticke, whom we now call a * *Philologer*; *Grammatista* as much as *Literator*, an Elementarie *Pedant*. They differ in effect as much as a Fidler, and an exact Musitian. *Sueton. de claris Grammaticis.*

* *Philologi audiunt Ludouicus Vives Iulius Scaliger, Casaubonus, nec non Ben. Ionsonius Poetarum facile princeps, & non sine doctrinæ, & humanitatis honorifica præfatione naminandus* πολύγλωσσος πολυμαθὴς *Iob. Seldenus.*

May that speech, which is compared according to the rules of Grammar, bee called congrua oratio, *in the proprietie of the latine tongue?*

So it is commonly called by most Schoole-masters: but to speake properly; *loqui congruè*, is to speake fitly, and oppositly to the purpose, which is the part of a Logician, an Orator, a Moralist: but to speake according to rule, is, *Grammaticè loqui*, which is not opposed to *Barbarè loqui* (for there may bee a rude impolisht and barbarous expression, where there is no breach of rule,

and

and *Priſcians* head is vntoucht) but to *caſtigate*, or *terſè*, or *emendatè loqui*, to ſpeake trimly and elegantly, according to the example of the pureſt Authors; according to that ſaying, *Aliud eſt Grammaticè, aliud latine loqui: Congruè loqui*, reſpects the fitneſſe of the matter; *Emendatè loqui*, the puritie of the ſtile; *Grammaticè loqui*, the regularitie of the conſtruction.

Is that diuiſion of Grammar into foure parts, Orthographia, Etymol. Syntaxis, Proſop. *an exact diuiſion?*

Priſcian, *Melanchthon*, and their followers ſo diuided Grammar: but g παχυλῶς, rather then h κατ' ἀκρίβειαν, it may more artificially and compendiouſly bee diuided into two parts, *Etymologie* and *Syntaxis*: for theſe two doe, as integrall parts, take vp the whole body of Grammar: the other two, *Orthogr.* and *Proſodia*, like Particles are contayned in theſe, and ſpread through the whole Grammar.

g *Craſſè.*
h *Exactè.*

25867

Of Orthographie.

Is Orthographie still the same?

No: It hath beene often changed, and therfore the rule of it must be custome. The Hebrewes, Syrians, and Arabians, begin to write from the right hand to the left. They of China, from the top of the leafe to the bottome in a direct line. Other Nations, from the left hand to the right; which motion of the hand seemes to be most naturall.

Of the Letters.

How are diphthongs made?

By the diuerse dispositions of the vowels.

Whence haue the diphthongs their names?

Of the Greeke words δὶς, *bis*, and φθόγγος, *sonor*; because there is a conflation, and coalition of two vowels in a diphthong, which are to bee vttered and breathed out as one entire syllable.

What is the meaning of that passage

in

in the first page of Lillies *Grammar?*
S, ſua cuiuſdam poteſtatis literaeſt?

Lilly hauing diuided the Conſonants into Mutes, as *b, c, d, &c.* and ſemi-vowels, as *l, m, n, r, ſ, x, z,* he ſubdiuideth the ſemi-vowels into liquids, and double conſonants, and ſince *(ſſ)* will not be changed in either of theſe rankes, hee calleth it *ſuæ cuiuſdam poteſtatis literam*; ſuch a letter as is (as it were) of its owne head, ſits by it ſelfe, will not be marſhalled in that *συστοιχία literarum*.

Why are x and z called, literæ duplices?

Becauſe they haue the force of two conſonants, as *x* may be reſolued into *Cs*, or *gs*, as appeares by the genitiue caſes of nounes ending in *x*, *Rex*, *Regis*, *Dux*, *Ducis*. *z* is changed (being a greeke letter originally) into *ſſ*, as *Muſſa*, of μάζα: *Patriſſo*, of πατρίζω.

How many wayes is the letter (I) *taken?*

Three wayes: as in this word *ieiunium*: in the firſt ſyllable, *I* is taken for a ſimple conſonant, in the ſecond

ſecond for a double one, in the third for a vowell.

How doth it appeare that (I) *betweene two vowels, is a double conſonant?*

Becauſe the Ancients, in ſtead of *Maior, Peior*, were wont expreſly to write *Maijor, Peijor*.

Hath (I) *betweene two vowels alwayes the force of a double conſonant, as* Lilly *tells vs here, and in the rules of Quantitie?*

No: The rule is true only in ſimple words, not in words compound, for in ſuch wee finde the ſyllable which comes immediately before *I* between two vowels, made ſhort in the Poets: as in *Biugis, Quadriugus*.

Martis equi biuges, & magni currus Achillis. Virg.

Centum quadriuges agitabo ad flumina currus. Idem.

Lilly in the diuiſion of his letters, tells vs, that two is a ſemi-vowell: how then comes it to paſſe, that anon after he ſaith, *y* & *z*, *latinis dictionibus nunquam admiſcentur*.

It is very ſtrange a man ſhould ſo

loone

ſoone forget himſelfe: there is a manifeſt contradiction, from which I cannot acquit him.

Are not k *or* y *mixed amongſt other latine letters, as* Lilly *affirmes?*

K is iudged by the modern Grãmarians to bee an vnprofitable letter, but * *Anſonius* ſaith, it is prefixed before three latine wordes: which ſome aſſigne to bee, *Kaput*, a Chapter, *Kalendæ*, *Kalumnia*: and as for *y*, if it be not mixed amongſt latine letters, how is it that wee finde in *Propria quæ maribus*, *Tybris*, *Lybs*, *Tybur*: proper names, *Phryx*, *Gryps*, *Hydrops*, *Syren*, *Hyems*, *&c.* appellatiues: nay, how is it that in the very ſame page, where hee affirmes this, we finde theſe words: *Hymnus*, *Triſyllaba*, *Hieronymus*. Here as elſewhere, *bonus dormitat Lilius*.

* *Hæc tribus in Latio tantum addita nominibus.*

What are the literæ majuſculæ *put for when they are ſet alone?*

A. ſot *Aulus*, as *A. Gellius*; *Aulus G.* but ſome Criticks write *Agellius*.

B. among the Schoole-men, is put for *Beatus*.

C. V. *Celſitudo Veſtra*.

C. M.

25867

C. M. *Cæsarea Maiestas.*
D. *Diuus.* Doctor, *Dominus.*
E. T. *Excellentia Tua.*
I C. *Iureconsultus.*
M. *Marcus*, and *Magister.*
N. *Nomen ignotum, vel Nota.*
P. C. *Patres Conscripti.*
P. L. *Poeta Laureatus.*
P. C. *Poeta Coronatus*, vel *Palatinus Comes.*
R. *Rabbi.* R. T. D. *Reuerenda Tua Dignitas.*
S. *Sanctus.* S. P. D. *Salutem plurimam dicit.*
S C. *Senatusconsultum.*
V. C. *Vrbs condita &c.* vid. *Lilium.*

Is not a great decorum to bee obserued in the Poets, by the repetition of diuers letters, to expresse to the life the matters themselues?

Yes. *E.* serues to expresse lamentation, and sorrow: as, *Lachryma peredere humore exangues genas.*

F. To expresse blowing: as, *Terras turbine perflant.*

I. To expresse thin, and peircing things. *Accipiunt inimicum imbrem, nimisq; fatiscunt.*

L. To

L. To expreſſe lowe, and ſoft things.

Qualem virgineo demeſſum pollice florem
Seu mollis viola, ſeu languentis Hiacynthi. Virg.

M. To expreſſe great things: as, *Dorſum immane mari ſummo:* as alſo to expreſſe admiration. *Deum immortalem! hominum! fidem!*

N. hath a contrarie vſe; it contracts. *Frangitur inq; ſinus ſcindit ſeſe vnde reductos.*

R. To expreſſe fury, and anger; and rough, and terrible things. *Imprecor arma armis.*

S. By this *Virgil* deſcribes the noiſe of a tempeſt, *Emiſſamq; hyemem ſenſit Neptunus, & imis ſtagna refuſa vadis.*

T. To expreſſe ſlowneſſe: as, *Nec nos obniti contra, nec tendere tantum.*

V. To expreſſe obſcure things: *Tu planſus, fremituq; virum, ſtudiiſq; fauentûm.*

What wordes are to bee written with great letters?

1. Proper names, and ſuch as are thence

thence deriued, and the names of Arts.

2. Beginnings of Sentences in Prose and Verses in Poems.

3. Names of Offices, and Dignities.

Is it lawfull to mixe letters of another tongue with latine letters?

Yes somtimes, but very sparingly: as, *Liber phrasewn, signum diœréseos.*

Of Syllables.

Can we say that ea, ei, *and* ἀάω, *are words of two and three syllables, when as they consist only of vowels simply, and severally pronounced?*

Wee may for want of a better terme: but properly *syllaba* comming of συμλαβεῖν .i. *concipere*, signifieth a comprehension or vniting of diuers letters in pronuntiation with one tone, or spirit.

How many letters hath the largest syllable in the latine tongue?

Not aboue sixe: as *stirps.*

Of

Of the distinction of Syllables.

What rules haue you for the distinction, or diuision of Syllables?

Diuers: first, in the diuision of a word, those letters are to be ioyned together, which may bee ioyned in the beginning of a word: as in *Magnus Arustex*, the last syllables must bee *gnus* and *stex*, because *gn* and *st* may bee found in the beginnings of words, as *gnatus*, *spectrum*. Secondly, if a single consonant bee put in the midle betwixt two vowels, it shall belong to the latter, as *Pa-ter*: if two consonants be geminated, the first belongs to the first syllable, the latter to the latter, as *An-nus*. Thirdly, if the latter syllable begin with a vowell, the former shall end in a vowell, as *De-us*.

Doth not the second rule sometimes faile?

Yes, in composition, as *ab-uto*, the former syllable ends in a consonant, the latter begins with a vowel; so *abs-temius*, of *abs* and *temetum*.

Of

25867

Of Pronuntiation.

Whence hath a tone its name?

From the Greeke word τείνειν, to screw vp, or slacken the strings of an instrument of musick. As by the intention, or remission of the strings the sound is flat, or sharp: so according to the tone, or accent a syllable is shrilly, or depressedly pronounced.

In a word, whose penultima syllaba *is doubtfull, or common; where is the accent to be put?*

In the *antepenultima*, as *Célebris, Mediocris, Vólucris, Fúnebris*, thus in Prose; but in Verse, the accent is according to the measure: as *Pecudes, pictæq; volúcres.*

Is the accent to be plac't in antepenultima *in these words:* Deinde, proinde, perinde, aliquando, siquando, nequando, hucvsque, &c. *as* Lilly *would haue it?*

No: for it is an vndoubted rule receiued amongst the best Grammarians. *Polysyllaba, quæ habent penultimam positione longam penultimam acuunt*

acuunt vt deinceps, duntaxat, problema, extemplo: and herein *Lilly* thwarts his owne third generall rule of Tones: and hee is thwarted by *Quint. Instit. l.1. c.5.* where he saith, *Duabus longis sequentibus primam acui noster sermo non patitur.*

Haue propémodum, ádmodum, nihilóminus *the acute accent in* antepenultima, *for this reason only, to distinguish them from* prope-modum, admodum, nihilo-minus, *as* Lilly *beares vs in hand?*

No: but the reason why they are so accented, is, because these by composition being made one word, haue their *penultima* short by quantitie.

Lilly *tells vs, that* duntaxat, deinceps, deorsum, *haue the accent in* antepenultima, *to difference them from other words: Is that assertion true?*

No: for wee reade no where *dun taxat, dein ceps, de orsum*, as distinct words, as *per inde, pro inde.*

How is amabo *the aduerbe of flattering to be pronounced?*

Some pronounce it *ámabo*, to distinguish it from the verb *amato*, but bet-

25867

ter authoritie teacheth vs to pronounce *amábo*: as, *Dic verum mihi Marce dic amabo. Mart.* where *amabo* hath the *penultima* long by quantitie.

How is Ti *before another vowell to be pronounced?*

Alwayes as in the word *Oratio*, where (*t*) doth *liqueſcere*, and is to be pronounced as *z*, as if it were written *orazio*, except firſt, in the beginning of a word, as *tiara*: ſecondly, if *ſ* come before it, as *inſtior*: thirdly, in the poeticall infinitiues, as *mittier*: fourthly, in borrowed words, as *Poſtía, pragmatía.*

How are Greeke words, being made latine, to be pronounced?

According to their Quantitie, not according to the tone, or accent they had in their owne tongue: as, we are not to pronounce *Nicódemus*, but *Nicodémus*; not *Demónicus*, but *Demonícus*; not *Basílius*, but *Baſilíus*; not *Caſárea*, but *Caſaréa*; not *Eúbulus*, but *Eubúlus*: for the *penultima* of theſe is long by quantitie.

Of the Quantitie of Syllables.

Are we to write patrizo, *as Lilly doth in the rule concerning words long by position, or* patrisso.

I thinke we are rather to write *patrisso*, for *z* is not a letter proper to the latine tongue. and I find other verbes of imitation ending in *sso*, as *Platonisso*, *Philomisso*, *Atticisso* : nay, *Lilly* himselfe saith in his rules of the species of verbes. *Imitativa sunt &c. ut Patrisso &c.*

Is that rule, vocalis brevis ante mutam sequente liquida communis redditur, *to be understood indifferently, and equally of all the foure liquids*, l, m, n, r?

No: but of *(l)* and *(r)* very often, of *(m)* and *(n)* very seldome.

When of l *and* r?

In simple words, or such cõpounds whose mutes together with the liquids pertaine to the same syllable: and this is very necessarie to bee observed for these words; *obrodo*, *obrepo*, *obligo*, *obrumpo &c.* though they have a short vowell before a mute, and a

25867

liquid, yet are they long, and are neuer found ſhort, for as much as the liquid and mute in any of them, being compound words, doe not concurre to the conſtitution of a ſyllable: for theſe words are to be diuided, thus: *ob-rodo*, *ob-repo*, as appeares by the rules of *diſtinction* of ſyllables before.

When of m *and* n?

In Greek words, as *Cygnus*, *Progne*, *Atlas*, or ſuch as imitate greek words.

Giue ſome examples of l, r, *put after liquids, making the precedent ſyllables common?*

L is put after mutes in theſe words, *Hybla*, *Agathocles*, *Abodlas*, *Ciniflo*, *Noegla*, *Locuples*, *Atlas*.

R in theſe, *Celebris*, *Volucris*, *Exedra*, *Africa*, *Denigro*, *Apri*, *Arbitror*.

Why is the laſt ſyllable ſaue one m Caï, Vultei, Pompei, &c. *long in Poets, whereas as one vowell comes before another?*

Lillies Grammar doth not except theſe wordes from the generall rule *vocalis ante alteram &c.* but the reaſon of this production is, becauſe amongſt the Ancients they were writ-

ten

ten with (ji) and ſo were long by poſition, which manner of writing, though it bee not now in vſe, yet the quantitie of the ſyllable ſtill remains.

Doe onely innuba, pronuba, *compounds deriued of* nubo; dejero, pejero, *the compounds of* juro, *by compoſition change their long quantitie to ſhort?*

No: diuers other words alſo, as *Omnipotens, Sacroſanctus, apud Buchan. Bardocucullus*, Mart. *integer, ab in, & ager: auiternus, ab auum, & aternus, nihilum, à ne, & hilum*: the ſecond ſyllables of which are ſhort in compoſition, long out of compoſition: ſo *ſiquidem, —ſiquidem ieiuna remanſit.* Ouid. *inbeo, à ius, & habeo*; whoſe firſt ſyllables become ſhort by compoſition.

Is that generally true: in t deſinentia breuia ſunt?

No; ſuch words are to be excepted which haue a conſonant before *t*, as *amant, eſt, refert*, and ſuch as are long by contraction, as,

Nomen abit, aut vnde redit maiore
triumpho. Lucan.

If all nounes ending in e, haue e ſhort

25867

by quantitie, except the ablat. of the fifth declenſion, how is it that wee finde e *in* fame *long in* Virg. *a noune of the third declenſion, as,*

Amiſſis (vt fama) apibus morboq; fameq́.

It is not ſo made by *Caſura*, becauſe it is not a ſyllable produced after a foot full and compleat falling any of the kinds of *Cæſura* in Grammar ſpecified, we muſt therefore ſay that anciently *(fames)* was of the fift declenſion, but now vſed onely in the third, yet here retaines the ſame quantitie which it had in former times, when it was of the fift.

Is that true which Lilly *hath:* Pes vna cum compoſitis, vt præpes, bipes *&c?*

No: *Præpes* ſignifieth ſwift, not on foot, but in flying, it is not compounded of *præ*, and *pes*, but deriued rather of *præpeto*, to haſten to with ſpeed: it is commonly vſed in the Poets, as an epithite of the Eagle, which is conſecrated to *Ioue*, *Præpes adunca Iouis*, *Ouid.* In *Tully*, *præpes auis*, is the bird that firſt ſheweth himſelfe to the Augur,

gur, whereby hee declares things to come: it may appeare by analogie very euidently, that *præpes* is no compound of *pes*: *bipes* makes *bipedis*, *quadrupes quadrupedis* in the genit. case, but *præpes præpetis*, not *præpedis*.

Is that rule of Lilly *true*, Longæ sunt omnes voces quartæ inflexionis in *us* præter *nom. & voc. sing.*

No: for the dat. and ablat. plurall in *us*, of all words of the fourth declension are short, as well as the nom. and voc. singular.

Of ETYMOLOGIE.

WHat is the meaning of that definition of Etymologie in Lilly. Etym. *est ratio cognoscendi casuum discrimina?*

The meaning of it is this: that in Etymologie is handled the differences of terminations of Nounes, Pronounes, and Participles, by declining of Verbes by their coniugating from their first themes: as for example, the variations of *Musa* in the oblique Cases, are called *Casuum discrimina*:

25867

ſo likewiſe the differences of endings of *doctus*, whether it be varied by declining as *doctus, a, um*; or by compariſon, as *doctus, ior, iſſimus*, are called *caſuum diſcrimina*. *Caſus* here is not to bee taken in ſo ſtrict an acception as it is afterwards, where it is ſaid, *Caſus ſunt ſex*, for it is attributed to a verbe alſo, for the variation of the verbe *Amo* in all Tenſes, Perſons, and Moodes, from its ſimple ſelfe are called in this definition, *Caſuum diſcrimina*. But yet mee thinkes the definition is too narrow, though wee doe ſtretch the words after this manner, and comprehendeth vnder it onely the declineable parts of ſpeech, for though almoſt all aduerbs deriued from adjectiues be compared, and ſo bee varied in termination (yet they haue this nature as deriued rather then as aduerbs) and ſome few prepoſitions, as *ſupra, ſuperior, &c.* yet not any conjunction, or interjection admitteth of *Caſuum diſcrimina*, and very hardly any aduerbe which is ſo primitiuely, and originally.

Of

Of the parts of Speech.

Of a Noune.

How are there eight parts of ſpeech, ſince a Pronoune, and a Participle haue the ſame things which belong to a Noune, to wit, Number, Caſe, Gender, and Declenſion?

A Pronoune, & a Participle agree, and communicate with a Noune in theſe, but yet they haue ſeuerall and peculiar differences by which they are diſtinguiſhed, and conſtitute ſeuerall parts of ſpeech: a Pronoune is diſtinguiſhed from a Noune by difference of Perſon, and from a Participle by Time, and ſignification.

Why doe you ſay that a Noune admits not difference of perſons: when as Magiſter *in the nominatiue caſe is of the third perſon, in the vocatiue of the ſecond perſon, according to that rule. The ſecond perſon is ſpoken to, as,* Tu, Thou, *and of this perſon is euery vocatiue caſe?*

A vocatiue caſe is ſaid to be of the ſecond perſon, not becauſe it is ſo of its proper ſignification, but by reaſon of the pronoune, *Tu*, with which it doth

25867

doth agree in the ſame caſe by appoſition.

This anſwere is giuen by ſome to make Lillies *definition of a noune good, but in the definitions of* Friſchline, Melanchthon, Scaliger, *and* Finkius, *there is no want of difference of Perſon mentioned to difference it from other parts of ſpeech.*

'Tis true: The ſtreame of beſt Grammarians run, that a noune hath *Perſons*, but thus is diſtinguiſhed from a *Pronoune*, which ſignifies a thing with difference of Perſon as well as a Noune: a Noune ſignifies firſt, a Thing; ſecondarily, a Perſon: a Pronoune, firſt a Perſon; ſecondarily, a Thing.

If all Aduerbs, Coniunctions, &c. be parts indeclinable, how comes it to paſſe that ſome of them are the Nominatiue Caſes to their Verbes, and haue Adiectiues ioyned to them, agreeing with them in caſe, gender, & number, as in Martial: Dic mihi cras iſtud Poſthume quando venit: *and againe,* Magnum ſemper inane ſophõs: *or thus,* Et eſt coniunctio, Penes eſt præpoſitio. Vah eſt interjectio.

Crat,

Cras, and *Sophõs*, and the other particles before the verbe *eſt*, are not nounes, but as it were nounes inaſmuch as they ſupply the place of a nomin. caſe before the verbe, they are not properly nounes, but τεχνικῶς, artificially as *Melanchthon* ſpeaketh: and in the ſame manner are verbes ſometimes vſed.

Matutinum portat ineptus ave. *Mart.*
Quis expedivit Pſittico ſuum χαῖρε. *Per.*
Scire tuum *nihil eſt*. Idem.

Doe not the nounes, Hora, Dies, Menſis, Annus, *ſignifie difference of Time, as well as a participle; doth not the Time of an Houre differ from the Time of a Day, and the ſpace of a Moneth from the ſpace of an Yeere? how is it then that* Lilly *ſaith, a noune doth not ſignifie difference of Time?*

'Tis true indeed, that theſe nounes conſidered cõparatiuely among them ſelues, doe ſignifie Times which differ among themſelues, but conſidered abſolutely, and each by it ſelfe, they doe barely ſignifie a ſpace of Time, not conſignifie Time beſides its prime ſignification, as a participle doth;

25867

doth; as *amans* doth not onely ſignifie the action (or rather paſſion) of louing, but conſignifies the preſent time.

Are not ſome ſubſtantiues varied by three terminations.

Yes: we reade *Syngraphus, Syngrapha, Syngraphum: Intybus, Intyba, Intybum: Veſper, & veſperus, ra, rum.*

How doth that definition of a noune ſubſtantiue proper, hold: Quod vni ſoli conuenit; *when as we reade many proper names in the plurall number?*

The definition is true notwithſtanding that exception: for a proper name in its owne nature is attributed but to one in the ſame *ſpecies*, but by accident to many. Firſt, when the ſame name agrees to many men: as, *Virgilij, Simones, Scipiones.* Secondly, when a noune metaphorically noteth a propertie or ſimilitude: as, *Catones*, for Wiſe-men. Thirdly, when the names of Nations, or Families, take vpon them the nature of appellatiues, as the *Latini* from *Latinus*, *Fabij* from *Fabius*, the Authors and Founders of that Nation, this Familie.

Of

Of the Accidents of a Noune.

Of Species.

When is a word ſaid to be of the primitiue ſpecies?

A word is ſaid to be of the primitiue ſpecies, which is as the ſtemme, or roote, whence other wordes as branches doe ſprout forth; or as the fountaine, whence other words as riuolets doe iſſue and flow forth, which are therefore called deriuatiues, as the noune of the primitiue ſpecies is *nauis*, of the deriuatiue ſpecies, are, *nauigo*, *nauicula*.

Is ſpecies taken properly in Grammar, or metaphorically?

Metaphorically: ſpecies properly ſignifies an image, picture, or reſemblance of any thing: the reaſon of borrowing this word, is this: as the image which repreſents it ſelfe to the eye of the body by a direct ray, is the prime image; that which is repreſented by a reflected ray is a ſecond image begot of the firſt: ſo that word which repreſents it ſelfe to the

25867

the Vnderstanding (which is the Eye of the Soule in its prime estate, is a word of the primitiue species, that which issues from the former of the derivatiue.

What is a noune collective?

A noune which collecteth, gathereth, and vniteth a companie, or multitude, in the singular number: as, *Exercitus*, an Armie; *Grex*, A flocke of sheepe; *Examen*, A swarme of Bees.

If Quis *bee sometimes a noune interrogative, sometimes a noune indefinite; how comes it to passe that* Lillie *claps it in amongst the pronounes afterwards, and subioynes to the rules of pronounes a catalogue of the compounds of* Quis?

It seemes to bee placed out of due order; vnlesse peraduenture it visite the pronounes by reason of some seeming affinitie it hath with *Qui*.

It is said in the English Rudiments, that Quid *is alwayes a substantiue of the neuter gender, is that true?*

No: *Quid* is not a substantiue, but is put sometimes substantiuely with a genitiue case: as, *Quid noui?*

Is

Is not Quid *sometimes vsed for* Magnum?

Yes: as, *Nescio, quid certe est, & Hylax in limine latrat.* Virg.

Nescio, quid certè est, quod me tibi temperat astrum. Pers.

So among the Greekes, τί is vsed for μέγαν, as ἔοικεν τὶ εἶναι, οὐδενὸς ὄντες ἄξιοι, Plat. in ap. Socr.

Why are Vnus, Duo, Tres, Quatuor, &c. *the first kindes of numerall nounes of the primitiue species, called Cardinalls?*

Because the digit numbers are the first and chiefe numbers, vpon the which the rest doe depend, and turne as the doore vpon the hinges, which in latine are called *cardines*, the rest being but resumptions of them. So the foure great and chiefe windes, are called the Cardinall windes, and the chiefe, and mayne point in any businesse, is called, *Cardo causa.*

Whence is a noune Patronymicke derived?

From the Greeke words, Πατὴρ, a Father; and ὄνυμα, a Name; which hath its name from the father. So it onely

25867

onely signifies; being strictly taken according to the *Etymon.* as *Tydides*, the sonne of *Tydeus*; *Pelides*, the sonne of *Peleus*; but yet it is vsed in a larger extent, to signifie many other relations by marriage, as *Æacides*, the sonne, or nephew of *Æacus*; *Nerine*, the daughter or neece of *Nereus*; *Menelais*, the wife of *Menelaus*.

Of Figure.

What doe Grammarians meane when they aske that question: Cuius est figuræ est hoc nomen?

They aske whether it bee a simple noune, as *parabilis*, or a compound as *reparabilis*, or a decompound as *irreparabilis*.

Doth not composition sometimes change gender?

Yes: for πῖμος is of the mascul. gen. but *atomus* the compound is of the femin. φθόγγος, is of the mascu. gender, but *diphthongus* is of the femin.

Are there not diuers words which are vsed by latine Authors, which are compounded of greeke and latine words, and latine and greeke words?

Yes;

Yes: these are compounded of greeke, and latine words:

Monoculus, Bigamus, Anthropophagus, for which some had rather say *Vnoculus. Digamus. Anthropophagus.*

Archigubernus, Protonotarius, Archidux, &c. These of latine, and greeke words: * *Prologus*, and therefore they make the first syllable long; *Epitogium, Elogium, Granitona, Semidiameter, Bissyllabum, Imbuo, ab in, & βύω, Induo, ab in, & δύω, &c.* vide *Rod. Boclen. prob. Gram. l. 3. 29. p.*

* Of this ranke *Cooper* in his Dictionarie makes *Homocapnus*, which hee englisheth most ridiculously, One that sitteth alwayes in the smoake, or by the fire, as it were a compound of *homo* and καπνος: wheras indeed it is wholly a greeke word, and signifies, One that enioyes the same fire, or smoake with another, an epithite giuen to a wife by *Arist. l. 1. Polit.*

Of Number.

Is that rule true concerning all nounes; the singular number speaketh of one, the plurall of more then one?

No: some nounes are singular by position, or termination, but plurall in sense and vnderstanding, as *Turba, concie, exercitus, &c.* Againe, some nounes are plurall by position, and singular in sense: as, *Athenæ, litera, &c.*

25867

Of Case.

Is it necessarie to make a seuenth or eighth Case?

No: the seuenth which Grammarians make by an ablatiue case with a prepositition, is altogether superfluous, for no prepositition enters into the essence of a case, so likewise is their eighth case, for it is the datiue put for the accusatiue, with the prepositition *ad*: as, *It clamor cœlo*. i. *ad cœlum*. Virg. *Quarere sibi adiumenta honoribus*. i. *ad honores consequendos*. Cic.

* In *cœlum* is not a good interpretation.

Why is the Ablatiue called Latinus Casus?

Because it is proper to the Latines; the Greeks altogether want it.

How then is it that we finde in Tully Iat. *prepositions which gouerne onely an ablatiue case, construed with greeke nounes?*

'Tis true, there is such *syntaxe* found in *Tully*, as 13. *Ep. ad Att. Id ab* ἐποχῇ *est remotissimum*: and elsewhere. *Prudentia cum* ἐυμενείᾳ: where the words ἐποχῇ and ἐυμενείᾳ, though they be the datiue

datiue caſe, take vpon them the nature of the ablatiue.

Of Gender.

Doth not the feminine gender ſometimes imply the maſculine, as well as the maſculine the feminine?

Yes; hereof are diuers examples in Authors. *Plaut. in Ciſtell. Scen. Niſi quid. Eam (rem) vult ſuæ matri, & patri, &c. vbi (ſuæ) innuit (ſuo)*

Curtius is called *Fama* by *Virg. in Culice.*

Hic & Fama vetus nunquam moritura per ævum. Curtius.

Maieſtas veſtra, is the ordinarie title of a King.

Poteſtas, doth ſignifie Magiſtrates, and Iudges: *Feneſt. c. 26. De Procuratore Cæſaris, cæteriſq; Romanis poteſtatibus.* Sueton. in Claud. Cæſ. *Iuriſdictionem de fidei-commiſſis quotannis, & tantum in vrbe delegari magiſtratibus ſolitam in perpetuum, atq; etiam per prouincias poteſtatibus demandauit.* So Saint *Paul* Rom. 13. 1. vſeth ἐξουσίαι ὑπερέχουσαι, which *Beza* renders, *poteſtates ſupereminentes*, to ſignifie Kings:

25867

ſo *Nobilitas*, is in *Lucan* put for the Nobilitie, or Peeres of a Land. *Nobilitas cum plebe perit.*

Are all names of Males of the maſc. gender, of Females of the feminine; and all nounes that ſignifie both ſexes of both genders?

No: ſometimes one and the ſame gender doth agree to both ſexes, as is apparant in the names of birds, fiſhes, and other creatures, whoſe ſexe is not ſet forth by ſeuerall wordes: as in *Paſſer*, *Aquila*, *Oſtreum*. So *Liberi*, though it bee onely of the maſculine gender, is put both for ſonnes and daughters, and *mancipium* of the neut. gender, onely ſignifies a bond-man, or a bond-woman, a Hee, or a Shee captiue.

Is that a proper ſpeech which is ſet downe in the Engliſh Rudiments: the maſculine gender is declined with this article, *Hic?*

No: it is very harſh and inſolent; no gender, being the accident of a noune, can bee ſaid to bee declined; but euery noune which is declinable is declared to bee of the maſculine gender

der, hauing the article *Hic* prefixed.

Why are articles vſed in Grammar?

Not to point out an *individuum*, or particular Thing, or Perſon, nor to diſtinguiſh ſexe, for Grammar conſiders not the natures of things, but the names onely, as *Lilly* himſelfe confeſſeth, but to difference one gender from another: an article doth not make a noune of ſuch, or ſuch a gender, but demonſtrates it to be ſo: it is not the cauſe of the gender, but the ſigne.

Vpon *Propria quæ maribus.*

Is that marginall note true, which the Poſer of the Accidence *hath in his margent vpon the firſt generall rule touching proper names*, viz. Cocytus, *the name of a Fenne in hell, is of the fem. gender.*

No: I finde it of the maſc. gender in the moſt refined Authors:

Viſendus ater flumine languido Cocytus. Hor. 2. Car.

Inamanum forte ſedebat Cocytum iuxta. Stat. 1. Theb.

Is that exception of Stockwood *to the ſecond generall rule of proper names,*

25867

good, viz. that Epidaurus, *the name of a Citie is of the masc. gender?*

No: for I finde it of the fem. gender in *Martial*. *Aereis impostа iugis, medicamq; Epidaurum.*

How are the proper noune, Opus, *a Citie, and the appellatiue*, Opus, *a worke, distinguished?*

By their genitiue cases: *Opus*, the noune proper maketh *Opuntis*: *Opus*, the appellatiue, *Operis*.

What is contayned in the first generall rule?

Thus much: These all are masculines: the names of Gods, the names of Men, of Moneths, of Windes, of Floods.

Are none to be excepted?

Yes; *Styx*, and *Lethe*, which are riuers of hell, found in the Poets of the femin. gen. —*Styx inde nouem circumflua campo*. Stat. —*soporifera biberem si pocula Lethes*. Ouid. we need not excuse *Lilly*, by saying they are Fennes, not Riuers. So *Albula* of the fem. gen. as, *Albula pota Deo*, where we neede not force a Syncheris; the rule must be squared to the examples, not

not the examples to the rule.

What is contayned in the second generall rule?

Thus much: the names of women, Earthly and Diuine, of Regions, Cities, Iles, are feminine.

Are none to be excepted?

Yes: besides those which are expressed, these, *Londinum, Eboracum, Brundusium, Pergamon,* are of the neut. gen. as Virg. *Miramur Troia cineres, & flebile victis Pergamon.*

Of the generall rules of Appellatiues.

If suber, *and* filer *be rightly placed in* appellatiua arborum &c. *how is it that wee finde them againe in the second exception of neuters, from the third speciall rule?*

I cannot excuse *Lilly* herein, it is a vaine exception, or Tautologie.

Of Epicens.

May not the rule, sunt etiam volucrum &c. *be spared?*

Yes, as I conceiue: for first, it be-

25867.

longs not to a Grammarian, but to a Philoſopher, to conſider the difference of ſexes. Secondly, the genders of the names of birds, wilde beaſts, and fiſhes, are to bee knowne by the rules following. Thirdly, if this rule ſhew the gender of thoſe nounes in the ſame ſpecified, how is that wee finde the genders of them ſet downe againe: of birds, as *Halcyon*, *Bubo*, *Perdix*, *Phœnix*, *Nyctiserax*: of beaſts, as *Elephas*, *Linx*: of fiſh, as *Halec*.

If all nounes appellatiue ending in um, *be of the neuter gender, according to that rule*, Omne quod exit in *um. why doth* Lilly *ſay againe in the ſecond exception from the firſt ſpeciall rule*, Et quot in *on* vel in *um*.

I thinke that part touching nounes ending in *um*, might be ſpared, and the rule better thus contracted.

Neutrum nomen in e, *ſi* gignit Is *vt mare, rete.*

Et quot in on, ſea *Barbiton. Et pelagus, lacoethes.*

Hippomanes, virus. Neutrum modo, tum modo vulgus.

What is the meaning of Inuariabile nomen?

Not

Not only *euery ſubſtantiue vndeclined*, as the Poſer of the *Accidente* ſpeaks: but alſo all *nomina τεχνικὰ*, *viz.* all clauſes which are the nominatiue caſe to the verbe, as in that clauſe, *didiciſſe fideliter artes Emollit mores*; *didiciſſe fideliter artes* muſt be conceiued to be of the neuter gender, as alſo all verbs of the infinitiue moode vſed ſubſtantiuely, whether they come before their verbe, or follow after; as, *Velle ſuum cuiq, eſt.* Perſ. *Videamus beate* viuere veſtrum *quale ſit.* Cicer. *Plaut. in Curc. ſc.* 1. *Ita* tuum *conferto* amare *ſemper ſi ſapis. Ne id quod ames, populus ſi ſciat, tibi ſit probro.* Idem in Bacchid. ſc. Iamdudum. *Hic* vereri *perdidit* i, e, *verecundiam.*

What doe you thinke of that which is annexed to the firſt ſpeciall rule, Labes, labis. Peſtes, peſtis.

Peſtes is here ſet downe by *Lilly* (or I know not who) as the nomin. caſe, which word is not found in any pure Author, nor in any Lexicon; and it ſeemes rather to bee an error of the Compoſer then a ſlip of the Printer, inaſmuch as hee would

25867

haue *pictis* by analogie, the gen. caſe of *peſtes*, as *labis* of *labes*; this hath paſſed in all editions that I haue ſeene without correction: the true nomin. caſe is *peſtis*.

Doth Lilly *ſpeake properly, when hee ſaith,* Scriba, Aſſecla, Lixa, &c. *are the names of men?*

No: for in proprietie of ſpeech they are not the names of men, but of the offices, or imployments of men.

Is that generally true, Maſcula græcorum quot declinatio prima fundit, &c.

No: for as learned *Ramus* obſerues in his Grammar, there be many words borrowed of the Greeks by the Latines, which being of the maſculine gender and firſt declenſion, of the Greeks are of the feminine gender in latine Authors; which I haue comprized in this Diſtich:

Fœminei generis ſunt hæc Græcanica. Charta, Gauſapa, Margarita, Catarracta, & Catapulta.

Are funis, *and* ſentis *of the maſcul. gender?*

Ramus, and *Stephanus* ſay, they are of

of the Common of two: ſo alſo *Trebell. in Prompt. Sentis com. g. teſte Phoca. aſſra ſentes.* Virg. Æneid. 2. *Funis tam maſc. quam fœm. teſte* Gellio lib. 13. *citante verſ. Lucret.* Autea de cœlo demiſit funis in arua.

Is rete *alwayes of the neuter gender?*

We reade both *retis*, and *rete*, *rete* is alwayes of the neuter gen. *retis* of the maſc. *Varro.* this is a noune redundant: as alſo, *Barbiton*, for wee reade in *Horace*, *Barbitus*, of the fem. gender. *Age dic Latinum Barbite carmen. Carm. l.* 1. *Ode* 32.

Is Halcyonis of the doubtfull gender, as Lilly *beares vs in hand?*

No: in this word *Lilly* was foulely deceiued, and by this hath deceiued others. Firſt, he was deceiued in that hee tooke for a word which did not encreaſe in the gen. caſe, where as it is in true the genitiue caſe of the nominatiue, *Halcyon*, a King-fiſher, ſo called, becauſe ſhee buildeth her neſt in the Sea, and there hatcheth her yong. Secondly, in that he ſaith it is of the doubtfull gender, where it is alwayes found with a femin. epithite.

as

25867

as *Virg. Dilecta Thetidi Halcyones.*
Nunc ego desertas alloquar Halcyonas.
Proper. *Maste.*
Halcyones lugubre dabant per littora carmen. Mant.

Secondly, hee deceiued others, amongst them the Construer of *Lillies* Rules, who swallowed downe this flie, putting *Halcyonis* for a King-fisher, and other ordinarie Schoolemasters following him, are deceiued also.

Is ficus *for a disease, of the doubtfull gender?*

No: * *Martial* who knew the gender of it better then *Lilly*, saith, it is of the [a] masc. gender.

Dicemus ficus, *quas scimus in arbore nasci*
Dicemus ficos, *Ceciliane, tuos.*

What is the meaning of the second speciall rule, Nomen crescentis &c.

The Poser of the *Accidence*, saith, this is the meaning: that euery noune substantiue cõmon, increasing sharpe, or long in the gen. case, that is, being lifted vp in pronouncing, or pronounced long, is of the feminine gender.

If

* *Martial Epigr. l. 1. Ep. 66.*

[a] *Sic quibusdam è plebe Grammaticis videtur: ego autem in Thome Farnabij viri πρωτιστεύτου sententiam pedibus eo; cuius verba in Notis ad hac Epigramma operæpretium erit recensere. Cum nihil hic de genere moueatur, neque apud probæ notæ autorem quempiam reperiatur ficus pro morbo in alio, quam fœmineo genere, vt & συνωνυμις Græca exponunt è suos liberos famulos, pueros delicatos.*

If Lilly *meane by* ſyllaba acuta, *a long ſyllable with an acute accent vpon it, then many of the words put in the rules of exception, are in vaine excepted, for many of them increaſe ſhort?*

'Tis very true: amongſt the maſculines excepted, theſe encreaſe ſhort, *Sal, ſalis. Vir, viri. Mas, maris. Pes, pedis. Grex, gregis. Phryx, phrygis.* Amongſt the doubtfull: *Scrobs, ſcrobis. Grus, gruis.* Amongſt the Common of two: *Dux, ducis. Bos, bouis. Sus, ſuis.*

Why doth Lilly *ſay*, Glis gliris habens genitiuo.

To diſtinguiſh it from *Glis gliſſis*, Potters clay, and *Glis glitis*, a Thiſtle, both which words are of the feminine gender.

Is not that rule, Maſcula in er, or, & os, *faultie?*

Yes, and it may bee thus compendiouſly amended: *Maſcula in er, or, & os, ſeu Crater, conditor, heros;*

In Dens, quale bidens: Torens, nefrens, orienſq;

Adde gigas, elephas, adamas, garamaſq; tapeſq;

25867

Atq; Lebes, magnes, hydrops, dodranſq; meridi-

Es. Phœnix, bombyx, thorax, vervexq; coraxq;

Sunt hæc fœminea in n *&* or, *Syren, ſoror, vxor.*

Why doe you turne out of this rule, Cures: Quæ componuntur ab aſſe vt dodrans, ſemis; & Mulier?

Cures is a defectiue, as *Gabij* and *Locri.*

First: *Cures* is no noune appellatiue, but a proper name of a towne of the Sabines; which is read onely in the plurall number. *Tutioq; ſens, Curibuſq; ſeueris.* Virg. Secondly, *Dodrans*, and *Semis*, are no compounds of *As*; firſt, *Dodrans* is no compound, as appeares by its ſignification, for it doth not ſignifie, *nine pounds*, which it ſhould if it were compounded of *dodra* and *as*, but nine ounces: as alſo by analogie; as of *decem* and *as* comes *decuſſis*, of *centum* and *as*, *centuſſis*; ſo by analogie of *dodra* and *as*, ſhould reſult *dodraſſis*, not *dodrans*: and herein *Lilly* forgot what hee had written before in the firſt exception of the firſt ſpeciall rule, that *ab aſſenata* were maſculines, not encreaſing in the genitiue

nitiue caſe. Secondly, *ſemis* is not found in any pure Writer as a ſimple word; it is not the nom. caſe of *Semiſſis*, but *ſemiſſis* is it ſelfe the nom. caſe, compounded of *ſemi* and *as*, which *ſemi* is alwayes found in compoſition, as *Semianimis*, *ſemivivus*, *ſemicircularis*, *ſemipedalis*. *Semibouemq́ virum*, *ſemivirumq́ bouem*. Ouid. and is deriued of the greek word ἥμι, which being turned into latine, in ſtead of the *aſper ſpiritus*, doth prefixe *ſ*, as ὕπερ, *ſuper*; ὕλη, *ſylua*. Thirdly, *Mulier*, though in moderne Poets it bee made to encreaſe long, yet in truth it doth increaſe ſhort, and ſo the beſt Criticks pronounce it: that it increaſeth ſhort may bee thus confirmed. Firſt, it is found, he laſt word in many verſes in *Terence*, which doe commonly end in an Iambicke foote. Secondly, it is found, in any place of *Virgil* or *Ouids* works in any oblique caſe, and it is more then probable, that a word of ſuch common vſe would not haue beene baulked by them, had not the three firſt ſyllables in the oblique caſes made a tribrachus,

25867

chus, of which their verſes are altogether incapable. Thirdly, that *Iambick Scazon* in *Martial*, where *(erum)* makes an *Iambus*: for a *Scazon* neuer admits of a *ſpondaus* in the ſecond odde place, put all out of doubt. *Amethyſtina ſq; mulierum vocat veſtes.*

Is perdix *of the doubtfull gender?*

It can ſcarce bee found in any Author of the maſculine gender, ordinarily of the femin. as *Ouid.*

Garrula ramoſa proſpexit ab ilice perdix.

Mart. *Et picta perdix.*

Mant. *Dadala perdix, &c.*

How may that rule, Sunt commune parens, &c. *be bettered?*

Thus: *Communis generis ſunt hæc infans adoleſcens,*

Dux, illex, hæres, exlex, auctor q; parens q;

Latro, cliens, cuſtos, bos, fur, ſus, at q; Sacerdos.

Why is Bifrons *turned out?*

Becauſe, though it bee ſometimes vſed ſubſtantiuely, yet indeed it is an adiectiue, an epithite of *Ianus.*

Sa-

Saturnusq; senex, Iunioq; bifrontis imago. Virg.

Is autor *vsed onely concerning Persons?*

Not sometimes concerning Things, as, *Multi ingenio sibi autore dignitatem pepererunt.* Cic. *Calor autor levitatis. Cometa sideris autoris sui sequitur naturam.* Scal.

Is Presbyter, *which is called in Grãmar,* Vox Ecclesiastica, *a good word or no?*

No: it hath beene vsed by modern writers, but is in truth a barbarous word: the true latine word is *Presbyterus*, borrowed of the greeke πρεσβύτερος.

What feminines are excepted from the third speciall rule?

In *Do*, vel *Go*, *Nomina hyperdissyllaba gignunt.*

Quæ Dinis, atq; Ginis sicut dulcedo, propago. To which these may more compleatly bee added:

Virgo, grando, fides, compes, teges, arbor, amazon,

Bacchar, hyems, mulier, syndon, gorgon, seges, icon.

Ordo, though it make *Dinis*, is of the masc. gen. because is is not an *hyperdissyllabon*: and *Macedo* is of the masc. gender, because though it be an *hyperdissyll.* yet it makes *donis*, not *dinis*, in the genitive case.

25867

What doe you thinke of that rule, Græcula *in* as, *&c.* caſpis, caſſis, cuſpis.

I thinke that therein *Lilly* was in part deceiued, for *caſſis* and *cuſpis* are originally latine words, not to bee found in any greeke Lexicographer.

Is euery word, ſignifying a thing without life, ending in a, *of the neuter gender?*

Yes, if it encreaſe ſhort in the genitiue caſe.

How is then that many Grammarians haue affirmed, that polenta, *though it encreaſe not at all in the genitiue caſe, is of the neuter gender?*

It is true, *Alexander*, *Sulpitius*, *Nebriſſenſis*, *Baptiſta Pius*, and *Calepine*, affirme ſo; and *Mantuan* being deceiued by the Grammarians of his time, did vſe it ſo, ſaying: *Montibus artocreas, & pingue polenta comedi.* But in *Apuleius* wee finde, *polenta caſeata offula.* In Varro, *Obiciunt his polentam hordeaceam*: the error aroſe firſt from the miſſe-conſtruction of that verſe in *Ouids Metam. Dulce dedit teſta, quod coxerat ante polenta*: they cooſined with a *comma* after *ante*, put in by

the non-intelligent Printer, thought *polenta* the accuſatiue, which was the ablatiue, as if the Poet had meant, *dedit dulce polenta*: which if it bee ſearcht into will be found non-ſenſe, for *polenta* ſignifieth dried barly, with which beere is brewed, but is not of it ſelfe any liquid thing which may bee drunke: the verſe is thus to bee conſtrued; *Dedit dulce*. i. *dulcem potum*, Shee gaue to *Ceres* ſweet drinke, *quod coxerat ante polenta*, which before ſhee had boyled with dried barly. *Ouid* takes *dulce* here in the neuter gender ſubſtantiuely, as afterwards, *liquidum*. *Inuenemq; cum liquido mixta perfudit Diua polenta*; *Ceres* beſprinkled the impudent boy which derided her, with the drie barly mingled with the liquor: ſo *Niniuita*.

Vide *Raphaelem Regium, Ouidij Interp. in 5. Metam.*

If verber *be read*, Robinſon *contradicts* Lilly, *affirming, that onely* verberis, *and* verbere *are read*.

It is no maruell though they diſagree, ſince in patching vp our Grammar they did not conferre their notes together.

Doth iter *belong to the rule of neutrall*

25867

words, excepted from the third ſpeciall rule, ſince it is declined iter itineris, *whereas thoſe which encreaſe in the genitive caſe, are to exceede the nom. imely in one ſyllable, and not in two?*

The genitive caſe *Itineris* is of an old word *Itiner*, which is growne out of vſe, not of *iter*, which is ſucceeded in its roome.

Pecus pecoris *ſeemes to bee of the fem. gender, as well as* pecus pecudis, *by that verſe of Ouid.* Hoc Pecus omne meum, multæ ſtabulantur in antris. *Multa*, in this verſe, doth not agree with *pecora*, but *pecudes* vnderſtood.

What is the meaning of Onyx cum prole?

That *onyx* with the off-ſpring, or compound thereof, *Sardonyx*, is of the doubtfull gender.

Is it any where found in the feminine gender?

No where, alwayes in the maſc.

Et crocino nares myrrheus ungat onyx. Propert.

In dextra candidus ardet onyx, &c.

Are Augur *and* Aruſpex *vſed in the fem. gender, as well as in the maſc.*

I doe

I doe not thinke any example can be shewed, where they are vsed in the feminine gender: the Romanes had a Colledge of Augurs, but wee neuer reade of any woman admitted fellow there. *Plautus* would not vse *Haruspex* for a Shee-diuiner, but *Haraspica*.

Is princeps *alwayes a substantiue of the common of two, as it is in* Lilly?

I thinke that it is primarily a substantiuely, yet vsed sometime in the roome and place of an adiectiue, as in that verse of *Horace*:

Principibus placuisse viris non vltima laus est.

Of the first declension.

Doe all nounes of the first declension, ending in a, *make the genitiue in* æ?

No: for wee reade *Paterfamilias*, *Materfamilias*, *Filiusfamilias* in the gen. euen in the best and purest Authors: and in the Ancients, *vias*, *terras*: the genitiue of *via*, *terra*.

Why did they write so?

In imitation of the Greekes, amongst whom all substantiues ending

25867

in *la*, *ra*, *pa*, and *a* with a vowell before it, forme the genitiue case by *as*.

It seemes that some latine words end in am, *as well as Hebrew in the nom. case. I reade in* Plautus; Ego patriam te rogo quæ sit tua, *where* patriam *seemes to be the nominatiue case: for if the sentence bee construed, the words must bee placed thus*; Rogo te quæ sit patriam tua?

The words cannot bee so placed: but here is an Antiptosis, the accusatiue put for the nominatiue, *patriam* for *patria*.

If all nounes of the first declension in as, *make the vocatiue in* a, *how is it that we reade in* Terence, Pythias *in the vocatiue case*, Quid festinas, aut quem quæris Pythias, *in Eun. Act.* 4. *sc.* 3.

In this there is an Atticisme: the Attick's in all declensions make the vocatiue like the nominatiue, and yet we finde regularly in the same Scene; *Paululum si cessassem Pythia, domi non offendissem.*

Are à Musa, à Magistro, *ablatiue cases?*

The vulgar Grãmarians confound Syn-

Syntaxis with Etymologie, when in declining a noune that say in the ablat. *ab hac Musa, ab hoc Magistro*; this is construction, not declining: if they will say, the prepositition is prefixed onely as a signe; I answere, that this signe is not perpetuall; this appeares in *Siquis, ecquis. Nequis, nunquis*: for none will say, *à siquo, ab ecquo, à nequo, à nunquo.* Goclen. problem. Gram. l. 1. p. 24.

Doth not anima *sometimes make the datiue, and ablatiue cases plurall in* abus, *as well as* Dea liberta &c.

Yes, and sometimes in *is* also: for we reade in *Cicero. Tullius Terentia, & Pater Tulliolæ duabus animis suis salutem dicit.*

Doe not words of the first declension make the datiue and ablatiue cases plurall, regularly in is?

Yes: but these which follow are to bee excepted, whereof some make *is* and *abus*, as nounes redundant; others *abus* onely: which for the helpe of memorie I haue reduced into this distich:

25867

Filia, nata, anima is *facium, atque* abus, *et* abus *Tantùm, Amba, atq; dua, liberta, equa, sic dea, mula.*

Of the second Declension.

How many terminations bee there of the second declension?

Eight: the examples of them I haue compiled in this Hexameter:

TemplVM, annVS, vIR, apER, SatVR, OrphEVS, IlioN, ArgOS.

Is there an imitation of the Attick dialect of the Greekes, which formes the vocative like to the nominative, in that verse of Ouid. Latmius Endymion non est tibi luna rubori, *as* Lilly *supposeth.*

I see no reason for that supposall, for *Latmius Endymion* is the nominatiue case to the verbe *est*, not the vocatiue: the Poet according to the true originall copie, doth not direct his speech to *Endymion*, but to the *Moone*: the meaning is, that *Diana* was not ashamed to descend to the louing embracements of *Endymion* on the hill *Latmus*. *Endymion* was an Astronomer, and for the cleerer sight

of

of the ſtarres, did often goe to the top of that mountaine, which gaue hint to the fable.

What words bee thoſe of the ſecond declenſion, which make the vocatiue in e *and in* us?

Theſe ſixe: which to helpe the memorie, I haue comprized in this verſe:

Hac: vulgus, lucus, populus, fluuius, chorus, agnus.

Doe not Quercus, *and* Laurus, *forme the vocatiue in* e, *or* us, *as well as theſe?*

Yes; but not in the ſame reſpect: for they forme the vocatiue in *e*, as of the ſecond declenſion: and in *us*, as of the fourth declenſion.

Doth vulgus *make the vocatiue in* e, *and in* us, *as of the maſc. gender.*

No: it hath that double terminaſion in a double conſideration: as it makes *e* in the voc. it is of the maſc. gender, as *us* of the neuter: and here alſo may be noted, that the ending of the reſt of the nounes in *us* in the vocatiue caſe, is an Archaiſme.

How doe greeke words in os, *as* Logos, *make the vocatiue?*

As the latine words in *us* regularly.

What

25867

What is the reaſon that Panthus, *and* Oedipus, *make the vocatiue in* u?

Becauſe they come of greek words in ῦς, which make υ in the vocatiue, which is rendred in latine by *u*.

Of the third Declenſion.

What nounes of the third declenſion make the accuſatiue caſe in im *onely?*

Theſe; which for memories ſake may thus rime:

Vim, rauim, ſitim, tuſſim,
Charybdim, maguderim, & amuſſim.

What nounes make the accuſatiue both in im, *and in* em?

Theſe: *Im, Em. faciunt, febris, buris,*
Peluis, puppis, & ſecuris.
Torquis, turris, aqualis, nauis.
Et bipennis, reſtis, clauis.

If the genitiue caſe of the third declenſion end in is, *how comes it to paſſe that wee reade* duri miles Vlyſſi. Immitis Achilli?

Concerning *Vlyſſi*, which *Virg.* vſeth in the genitine caſe, in the ſecond of his *Æneid.* (and the ſame is to bee ſaid alſo of *Achilli*) wee muſt ob-

obſerue that it is of the third declenſion of the contracts amongſt the Greekes, whoſe nom. ending in εὺς, and genit. in έος, as *Vlyſſeus, Vlyſſeos*; the ancient Grammarians were wont to diuide εὺς into two ſyllables, whoſe genitiue they made εϊ, diuided alſo, as *Vlyſsëus, Vlyſsëi*; and the vowels ſo diuided, they did againe contract into the diphthong ει, by Synecphonceſis, as *Vlyſſes.* for *Vlyſſei*: and afterward by Synæreſis they pronounced the diphthong by *i*, as *Vlyſſi* for *Vlyſſei.*

Doe any nounes of the third declenſion decreaſe in the genitiue caſe?

No: thoſe that imagine that *Iupiter* makes *Iouis* in the genitiue caſe, are deceiued; and thoſe that decline it ſo, may as well ſay. Nom. *Phœbus.* Gen. *Apollinis*, ſaith the Grammarian. *Probus Inſtitut. l.* 2. *Iupiter* is a Synonymon of the ancient nominat. caſe: *Iouis*, which was declined *Iouis* in the genitiue caſe alſo, but now the nominatiue is out of vſe, and *Iupiter* vſed in ſtead of it; but the other caſes keepe their ancient forme.

25867

Is that rule of Lilly *generally true, that Adiectiues, except those which end in* is, *and* en, *and make* e *in the neuter gender, make the ablatiue both* e *and* i?

No: for adiectiues ending in *us*, doe not make the ablatiue promiscuously in *e* or *i*: in this we must be very obseruant of the vse of authors, we may say, *me perlubente, me imprudente*; but we may not say, *me perlubenti, me imprudenti*: neither may we say *gaudenti, libenti, patienti, absenti illa factum est*: for the ablatiue of the participle of the present tense, being ioyned with another word put absolutely, ends onely in *e*: yet wee may say in another kinde of construction, *animo Gaudenti, patienti, latanti faciam. Goclen. probl. gram. l. 1. pag.* 16.

Is that rule of Lillie *generally true.* Comparatiua bifariam facient ablatiuum in *e* vel *i*?

No: the comparatiues of the fœminine gender doe most commonly make the ablatiue in *e*, as *latiore fame, secundiore fortuna, vocis contentione maiore, granitate acriore, commodiore valetudine, longiore via.* Comparatiues

of

of the neuter gender moſt commonly make the ablatiue in *i*, as *a Maroni, a Pari, a fortiori; ardentiori ſtudio, Cic.* vide *Goclen. ibid.*

Of the fourth Declenſion.

What words of the fourth declenſion make the datiue, and the ablatiue caſes plural in ubus.

Theſe comprehended in this diſtich for memory ſake.

Hæc in vbus, *ficus, portus,*
partus, ſpecus, arcus
Sic lacus, atque veru, ſic
quercus, acus, tribus, artus.

Of the fift Declenſion.

Is plebes, plebei *to be vſed by any one that would write purely?*

No: it was a word anciently vſed, but now is exolete: if *plebs* be a noune redundant, as *Robinſon* ſaith, then *plebes* muſt be the other nominatiue caſe; not *plebis*, as he ſaith in his rules of Heteroclits: *plebis* is no where found but in the genitiue of *plebs*.

Vpon

25867

Vpon *Quagenus, &c.*

What doe you thinke of that rule, Hæc genus, ae partim flexum variantia, &c.

I thinke it might very well haue beene spared. *Pergama* seemes to be the plurall of *Pergamon*, found in *Virg.* rather then of *Pergamus*. Some say that *supellectilia* is the plural of *supellex*, but is scarce to be found in any pure author: it fell not within the verge of the reading of the composer of these rules, and therefore hee saith, *Quod nisi plurali carent &c.*

What are nounes aptote?

Not such as haue no cases, but such as doe not admit of difference of terminations in obliq'e cases, they are deriued of *a*, a priuatiue particle, and πίπτω, *cado.*

Are cornu *and* genu *such?*

Yes.

Yet we reade that these haue other terminations, as cornuum, cornibus, genuum, genibus.

The rule is to be vnderstood of these in the singular, not in the plurall number.

What

What part of ſpeech is fas?

A noune adiectiue, vſed onely in the neuter gender; and of the ſame natue is *nefas*.

If Inſtar *be a noune, as* Robinſon *ſaith, how comes it to paſſe that in the ſyntaxis of aduerbs we finde this rule,* Inſtar æquiparationem, menſuram &c. ſignificat, &c.

It is an euident contradiction, and no maruell, ſince our Grammer is a *Cento* made vp of the ſhreds of ſeuerall men.

Is not the rule touching Triptots *faultie?*

Yes: firſt in that hee ſaith, *frugis*, and *ditionis* want their nominatiue caſes, whereas *fruges*, and *ditio* are found in good authors, and are not ſcrupulouſly to be refuſed. Secondly, in that he ſaith *opis*, hath the plurall number compleate and perfect: it is true, *opes* is read in all caſes in the plurall number, but it hath not any reſpect to *opis*, but is a feminine plurall, wanting the ſingular number, and is to be referred to that rule, *Hæc ſunt fœminei generis, numeriquę ſecundi, &c.* Againe,

25867

gaine the ſignifications of *opis* & *opes*, though they haue ſome kinred, yet they differ much; *opis*, helpe, *opes*, riches. If he will ſay that *opis* hath the plurall number, hee may as well ſay that *delicium* hath the plurall number alſo, for *delicia* is euery where read: and that *Trica*, *apina*, *pluga*, hath the ſingular number, for *trica*, *apina*, *pluga* are found frequently in the ſingular number in different ſignification.

Doth omnis *want the vocatiue caſe?*

No: we read in the Poet, *Dique Deaq; omnes*. O all ye Gods and Goddeſſes.

Haue no Pronounes the vocatiue caſe,
but onely noſter, noſtras, meus & tu?

Yes: *Ipſe* hath the vocatiue caſe alſo; as in the Poet,

Ipſe meas æther ſuſcipe ſumme preces.

How may Robinſons *rule be mended?*

Thus: *Et Pronomina, præter*
Quinque notanda. Meus, tu,
noſtras, noſter, & ipſe.

What Nounes want the plurall number?

All,

All, or the moſt part that for breuitie ſake are compriſed in this diſtich,

1. *Propria*, 2. *Virtutes*, 3. *Artes*,
4. *Penſa*, 5. *Uda*, 6. *Figura*,
7. *Morbi*, 8. *Herbæ*, 9. *Vitia*,
10. *Ætates*, 11. *Erumenta*, 12. *Metella*.

1. As *Thomas*, *Richardus*. 2. *Prudentia*, *Iuſtitia*. 3. *Grammatica Logica*. 4. *Piper*, *Saccharum*. 5. *Aromatices*. 6. *Synecdoche*, *Metaphora*. 7. *Podagra*, *Cephalalgia*. 8. *Amaranthus*, *Amaracus*. 9. *Deſidia*, *Anaritia*. 10. *Iuuenta*, *Senecta*. 11. *triticum*. 12. *aurum ferrum*.

Is not ſanguis *read in the plurall number?*

Yes, in eccleſiaſticall writers, but then the word is forced to expreſſe an Hebraiſme, as, *vir ſanguinum*.

Lilly *ſaith that* nemo *is of the common of two*, Robinſon *that it is of the maſculine gender; what doe you thinke of their variance?*

Phocas, and other Grammarians ſide with *Robinſon*, and they adde, that *Homo* alſo is of the maſculine gender,

25867

of which *nemo* is a compound. Neither of these nounes are found with an adiectiue of the feminine gender: it is true that *Terence* hath in his *Andria*, *Scio neminem peperisse hic*: and *Virg. nec vox hominem sonat*, speaking of *Venus*: and *Sulpicius* in an Epistle to *Cicero*, (wherein hee comforts him for the death of his daughter *Tullia*) hath these words, *Quæ si iam diem suum non obiisset paulo post tam ei moriendũ fuit, quam homo natus erat*: where *natus* doth not agree with *homo*, but *Tullia* vnderstood; and the deriuatiue *humanus* is attributed to a woman in *Horace*, *Humano capite* (to a womans head) *cervicem pictor equinam Iungere si vellet, &c.* as appeares by what followes, *mulier formosa superne*; but hence cannot be any infallible conclusion drawne, that *Homo* is of the feminine gender; and so, neither by consequence that *nemo* is of that gender: in this let euery one follow what hee himselfe seeth best grounds for.

Is it true that Cassida, æ, *is formed of* Cassida, *the accusatiue case of a Greek*

word

word Cassis cassidos ; *as* Panthera *of* Panther, *as* Robinson *would perswade vs.*

No : he, and his brother *Lilly* herein draw in the same line of error : *cassis* is primitiuely a latine word.

Is that true which Robinson *hath in his rules of redundant nounes, that* ador *and* ados *are both read in the nominatiue case?*

No : for *ador* is onely to be found, not *ados* ; the rule may be corrected by putting *odor* for *ador*, *odos* for *ados*, for both these words are read in good authors.

Are puber *and* pubes *of the same signification, as* Robinson *tels vs?*

No : *pubes* is properly a signe of ripenesse of age in men, at foureteene yeeres, in women at twelue, but *puber* signifies one that hath arriued at those yeeres.

May those luxuriant adiectiues which are derined of Arma, iugum, neruus, &c. *be vsed promiscuously?*

No : for though they be found in old writers, yet many of them are re-

25867

iected by those which haue refined the Latine tongue: we must not vse *inermus* so frequently as *inermis*, nor *sublimus* but *sublimis*, nor *proclinus* but *proclinis*, not *synceris* but *syncerus* onely, not *imbellus* but *imbellis*.

Of Adiectiues and their Comparisons.

How many terminations be there of adiectiues in the positiue degree?

Nine: all adiectiues end as one of these adiectiues:

SoleRS, excelleNS, locuplES, sublimIS, & audAX.

BelligER, atque satVR, prefulgidVS, atque RauennAS.

and here wee may note by the way, that *Rauennas*, *Arpinas* are declined as *Nostras*.

Is vnus *neuer vsed in the plurall number, except it be ioyned with a word which wanteth the singular number.*

Yes, among the Poets, who for verse sake often vse the plurall number

ber for the ſingular, as *Virg. ſatis vna ſuperque vidimus excidia.*

What adiectiues be there which may be encreaſed, or diminiſhed in ſignification, and yet are not compared in pure writers?

Theſe; *Vulgaris, vetulus, balbus, ſylueſter, equeſter,*
Delirus, criſpus, claudus, camuſque canorus,
Gallicus atque cicur, memor, almus, calluus, egenus, &c.

What adiectiues are not compared at all by a proper compariſon?

1. Thoſe that end in *us, purum*, as *egregius*. 2. Participials in *dus*, as *colendus*, which is vſed by ſome in the ſuperlatiue, *colendiſſimus*: it were more pure to ſay, *maxime*, or *admodum colendus*. 3. Adiectiues in *plex*, as *quadruplex*, except *ſimplex*, *multiplex*. 4. In *imus*, as *maritimus*. 5. In *iuus*, as *fugitiuus*: but yet we read *feſtiuior*, *feſtiuiſſimus*. 6. Deriuatiues in *inus*, as *matutinus*. 7. Compounds of *fero* and *gero*, as *legifer*, *corniger*.

Is that true that the comparatiue doth

25867

signifie the positiue with magis.

No: for the comparatiue doth *magis significare. i.* hath a larger signification then the positiue, though it doth not *significare positiuum cum magis*, becaule the denominatiue doth not signifie the *Noune* from which it is deriued, but the *Thing* after another manner: ſo the comparatiue ſignifies a thing, not a noune.

Which adiectiues want the positiue degree?

Beſides, *deterior, potior, ac ocyor*, thoſe which are deriued of theſe prepoſitions, comprehended in this verſe:

Ante, infra, ſupra, extra, intra, vltra, poſt, prope, citra.

Which adiectiues want the comparatiue degree, yet haue the ſuperlatiue?

Theſe: *Inclytus, at q3 ſacer, falſus, fidus, meritus q3*

Nuper, & innitus, nouus, & iuriſconſultus, &c.

Which adiectiues want the ſuperlatiue, yet haue the comparatiue?

Theſe: *Longinquus, inuenis, declinis, & infinitus.*

Atque

Atque ſenex, ingens, adoleſcens, atque propinquus. &c.

What adiectiues ending in dus *may be compared?*

Such as are primitiuely adiectiues, as, *Iucundus, ior, iſſimus: limpidus, ior, iſſimus: facundus, ior, iſſimus:* but nounes adiectiues participials may not be compared: it is true that ſome modern writers haue compared them according to Analogie; but yet therein they haue ſwarued from the vſe of the moſt pure authors; & this liberty they tooke to expreſſe the abundance of their ardent affection, reſpect and obſeruance to their Patrons and Superiours; and therefore wee ſeldome or neuer finde them compared, except in the frontiſpices of Dedicatory Epiſtles. But *Certiſſima loquendi magiſtra conſuetudo*, ſaith *Quintilian:* we may not ſay, *reuerendiſſimo viro*, but *reuerendo*: not, *Vir recolendiſſimæ memoriæ*, but *colendæ, recolendæ:* nor *venerandiſſimus*, but *cum primis, vel maximè venerandus. Goclen. Prob. l.* 1. *p.* 22.

25867

How are verbals in bilis *to be compared?*

Not beyond the comparatiue. Wee read, *formidabilis*, *formidabilior*, but neuer, *formidabilissimus*, so *amabilis*, *amabilior*, but neuer *amabilissimus*.

How can noune substantiues be compared, since they cannot receiue any increase of signification?

When a noune substantiue is compared, the substance is not respected, but the qualitie: as *panior* is as much as *pæno vafrior*, more crafty or vnfaithfull then a *Carthaginian*. *Neronior*, as much as *Nerone Sauior*, more bloudy and cruell then *Nero*: so *oculissimus. i. dilectissimus*; as deare to one as his eyes.

Of a Pronoune.

Whence hath a Pronoune its name?

Quòd pro nomine ponatur. From being sometimes put in the roome and place of a noune, so *Scaliger* defines it,

l.6.

l. 6. de C. L. L. c. 27. Amongst the Lawyers *ea*, is put for *mulier*, and *ipsa* for *filiafamilias*: the Scholars of *Pythagoras* being asked a reason of their Assertions, answered, αὐτὸς ἔφη. *Hee hath said it*, that is, *Pythagoras*. *Plaut. in Casina. sc. si sapitis. Ipsam probera dixit, Ego eo, quo me Ipsa misit*: so wee in English say; the *stoutest Hee*. For the most couragious, or one that beares his head higheſt.

Can one, and the same pronoune bee called a primitiue, a demonstratiue, and a relatiue?

Yes: but not in one and the same respect, as for example: the pronoune *Ille* in respect of its originall is a primitiue, because it is not deriued of any other, in respect of its demonstration, or pointing out of some Person, or Thing a demonstratiue, in respect of its relation, a relatiue, because it repeates, or rehearses some thing, or person, of which there was mention before made.

How comes it to passe that nostri, *and* vestri, *are vsed in the genitiue case plu-*

rall,

25867

rall, as well as noſtrum, and veſtrum.

Becauſe *noſtri*, and *veſtri*, in the genitiue ſingular, ſignifie a multitude, therefore they are vſed promiſcuouſly with *noſtrum*, and *veſtrum*, in the plurall genitiue.

Wee finde in the Engliſh Rudiments. Quo, qua, quo, vel qui. *Is* Qui *read in the ablatiue caſe in the neuter gender?*

I thinke there can ſcarce any example bee found of that kinde: but, *Qui* is read in the ablatiue caſe of the maſculine, and feminine gender. *Quicum omnia communicem. Nemo erat, quicum eſſem lubentius*, *Cicer.* And *Virg.* 2. *Æneid. Quicum partiri curas, id eſt, cum qua*, ſpeaking of a woman *Acca*, one of the aſſociates of *Camilla*: this is, as I ſuppoſe, an Archaiſme, rather to bee obſerued then imitated.

Is that true which Lilly *hath*; Martialis, Pronomini Ipſe vocatiuum tribuere videtur, cum ait, vt Martis reuocetur, &c. A te Iuno petat ceſton, & ipſa Venus.

No:

No: Hee was moſt groſſely ouerſeene in the conſtruing of theſe verſes: if *ipſa* bee vnderſtood in the vocatiue caſe, *Martial* will be made to write plaine non-ſenſe: that the truth may appeare, and none may by credulitie ſucke in this error, I will ſubioyne the whole Epigram with the tranſlation thereof, it is to be found, *Epig. l. 6. ep. 13.*

* *Quis te Phidiaco formatam Iulia cœlo,*
Vt quis Palladiæ non putet artis opus.
Candida non tacita reſpondet imagine Lygdos;
Et placido fulget vinus in ore decor.
Ludit Acidalio ſed non manus aſpera nodo.
Quem rapuit collo parue Cupido tuo.
Vt Martis reuocetur amor, ſæuiq; Tenantis.
*A te Iuno petat * ceſton & ipſa Venus.*

* *Vide doctiſſimi Farnabij Notas in iſtud Epigramma.*

* ἀπὸ τῦ κεντεῖν κεστὸς dicitur .i. à pungendo. Ceſtus enim eſt baltheus veneris ποικίλος variegatus, & acupictus.

Iulia, who e're thy ſtatue ſawe, but thought
It was a maiſter-peece, by *Phidias* wrought?

Or

Or artfull *Pollas* ? In thy beauteous face
Such liuely cunning shines, such louely grace,
That the white marble some-what seemes to say.
Thy smooth-sleek hand seemes sportfully to play
With the pure *Acedulian* true-loues knot:
Which, pretie *Cupid*, from thy necke shee hath got.
Venus, to regayne *Mars*; and *Iuno*, *Ione*,
May aske of thee the embroidered Belt of loue.

Why is Cujas *handled among the pronounes ? is it because* Cujus *is there of which it seemes to be derined?*

No: *Cuias* is no deriuatiue pronoune, but a primitiue noune gentile, and is referred to the fourth declension of pronounes, because of the affinitie of termination, and declination with the pronounes, *nostras*, *vestras*.

How

How is that true which is in Lilly, *that* Ego, *and* Nos *onely are of the first Person:* Tu, *and* Vos *of the second, whenas* Ipse *is also both of the first and second Person?*

Ipse is not of the first person onely, or of the second person onely, as *Ego* and *Tu* are, but indifferently as well of the third person as of the first, or second; the meaning of *Lilly* is, that none of the pronounes, except *Ego*, and *Tu*, are onely of the first, and onely of the second person.

Why may not Egomet, Tute, Isthic, Illic, *bee numbred among the demonstratiues, as well as* Idem *among the relatiues?*

I see no reason to the contrarie, if it had pleased the Composer of the *Accidence*, so to haue ranked them; if composition excludes them, it excludes *Idem* also.

Of a Verbe.

No sentence or propesition can bee a part of speech: how can a verbe then bee a part

a part of speech since it is a sentence: All verbes of the first or second person, are sentences, as also all verbes of the third person, as often as a certaine person is understood; as pluit, ningit, grandinat, Deus scilicet, vel natura, vel aliquid simile?

Such propositions as these, the Logicians call *implicite*, which are resolued into explicite propositions, by supplying the nominatiue case, and resoluing the verbe into a participle of the present tense with the verbe *sum*, thus, *scribo*, i. *ego sum scribens*; *pugnat*, *tu es pugnans*; *pluit*, *cœlum est pluens*, &c. an explicite proposition cannot bee a part of speech, but an implicite may, forasmuch as it cannot bee compleate without a supplement.

What is a verbe deponent?

Such a verbe, as amongst ancient Authors was a verbe Commune, and had both actiue and passiue signification, but now amongst purer writers, *deponit* hath laid off that nature, and signifies onely actiuely, hauing a passiue

ſiue termination, as *meditor, obliniſcor, aggredior, &c.*

Is that true in the Accidence: *ſuch verbes as haue no perſons are called impersonals?*

No: Impersonals are not ſo called becauſe they haue no perſons (for they haue as wee ſee) very many of them, the voyce of the third perſon both actiue and paſſiue, but becauſe they haue not any certaine ſignification either of number, or perſon, vnleſſe ſome noune, or pronoune be ioyned to them in an oblique caſe, as *oportet me*, ſeemes to be of the firſt perſon, and ſingular number. *Oportet nos*, of the firſt perſon plurall. *Oportet te*, of the ſecond perſon ſingular. *Oportet vos*, of the ſecond perſon plurall. So *Lilly.*

Are verbes Commune now in vſe?

Very few: we ſhall ſcarce finde any verbes in pure Writers, that ſignifie both actiuely, and paſſiuely: there were ſuch amongſt the Ancients, which in ſignification did anſwere the meane voyce of the Greekes, as

25867

as Lincoer is of opinion.

Doth the Indicatiue Moode shew a reason true or false, as the Accidence *defines it?*

No: for when I say, *Amo*, I loue: I make a simple affirmation by this word, not any confirmation of ought by reason.

Is not there a plaine contradiction in Lilly *touching the potentiall Moode?*

Yes: in his Etymologie, touching the moods of a verbe, hee hath these words: *Potentialis neq; vllum adverbium adiunctum habet, neq; coniunctionem.* In the Syntaxis, of an aduerbe these: *Dum pro dummodo alias potentiali, aliqs subiunctiuo nectitur.* In the Syntaxis of a coniunction, these: *Vt causalis, seu perfectiua coniunctio &c. nunc potentiali nunc subiunctiuo iungitur*; an euident contradiction.

Is that true which is in the Accidence: *the subiunctiue mood hath euermore some coniunction ioyned with him, as,* Cum amarem, *When I loued?*

No: in this speech there are two errors. First, the subiunctiue hath some-

sometimes an adverbe ioyned with him, as *Lilly* affirmes in the Syntaxis of Aduerbes. *Vbi pesquam &c. interdum indicatiuis, interdum subiunctiuis verbis apponuntur.* Againe, *Simulac &c. ind. & sub. adhærent.* Secondly, there is an errour in the example. For when *Cum*, signifieth *When*, it is not a coniunction, but an aduerbe of Time, so saith *Lilly*. *Vbi, postquam, & cùm, temporis aduerbia &c. Cùm canerem reges &c.* Virg.

To what purpose are the potentiall, and subiunctiue Moodes, since without these there is a perfect formation of verbs made?

If you respect the naked manner of forming, and difference of termination, they doe not at all differ; but if you respect the signification (of which is the right interpretation of Authors, there is great consideration to be had) the vse of these Moodes is very necessarie.

If the Infinitiue Moode haue neither number nor person, nor nominatiue case before it, to what purpose, is that first

25867

exception from verbum perſonale, &c. *placed in the firſt Concord*, viz. Verba infiniti modi pro nominatiuo accuſatiuum ante ſe ſtatuunt?

I thinke that that exception is altogether ſuperfluous; for how can a verbe which hath no perſon, nor number, make an exception from a verbe which hath both number, and perſon: it is in effect, as if *Lilly* had ſaid; from this rule can none bee excepted, but ſuch as are not capable of exception.

Whence hath the word Tenſe its originall?

From the French word *temps*, which ſignifies *Time*, which is pronounced *Tans*, and ſo *Tenſe*.

The common and received diuiſion of Time is in præſens, præteritum, futurum; how comes it to paſſe then that Grammar makes fiue Tenſes or Times?

The Philoſophers ſpeake otherwiſe then the Grammarians: the Philoſophers ſearching more narrowly into the truth, and nature of things, diuide all Time into that which is

paſt, preſent, and to come, becauſe if wee would ſpeake preciſely, all Time either is now, or hath beene, or ſhall bee hereafter: but the Grammarians who doe not ſo ſtrictly, and exactly weigh the natures of things, haue made for more facilitie in teaching, fiue Tenſes of latine verbes, according to the proprietie of the language. The Greekes haue eight Tenſes, not according to the truth of the matter, but according to the vſe, and proprietie of their tongue.

What doe you thinke of this paſſage in Lilly? Futurum, quo res in futuro gerenda ſignificatur. Hic promiſſivus modus à nonnullis vocatur.

It is very faultie. Firſt, here is confuſion of termes: for, *modus* is here put for *tempus*. Secondly, the particle *Hic* hath reference to *futurum*, and ſo there is a ſolæciſme, or at leaſt a ſolæcophanes; it may bee thus corrected: *Hoc tempus à nonnullis vocatur promiſſivum.*

If Deleo, *and* Impleo, *be compound verbes, whoſe ſimples are out of vſe;*

25867

how is it that wee finde in As in præsenti, *this*: Leo, les, leui, indeq; natum, Deleo deleui, pleo, ples, pleui?

Lilly did not well in concealing or omitting the abrogation, and extermination of these wordes out of the latine tongue; we may not vse these out of composition any more then *ffecio, lacio*, or *cumbo*.

Doth Edormisco *signifie incohation, or beginning of action.*

No: it is put for a verbe incohatiue by *Lilly*, but it doth not signifie to begin to sleepe, but to sleepe so long vntill the vapours arising from wine are dispersed: so in *Terence*, in *Adelp. Edormiscam hoc vilii*: like to this verb are many others, which though they end in *sco*, yet doe not signifie beginning of action, or passion; which is euident, because the Orators, Poets, and Historians, set before some of them the verbs: *Cæpi, incipio, incepto*; before others the aduerbs. *Paulatim, quotidie, magis*: as for example. *Cæpit erudescere morbus*. Virg. i. *Validior fieri*. Seruius.

Æ-

Ægreſcitq; medendo. i. *inter medendum fit ægrius.*

Incipiunt agitata tumeſcere. Virg.

Supercilia nonnunquam caneſcere incipiunt. Columel.

Cum incipit, oliua nigreſcere. idem.

Vbi conualeſcere cæperunt. idem.

Cum matureſcere frumenta inciperent. Cæſar.

Apud exteras gentes eniteſcere inceptabat. Gell. with them ſame verbs are, *hiſcere, lacteſcere, grandeſcere, clareſcere, iuueneſcere,* found.

Tua iuſtitia floreſcat quotidie magis. Cic.

Quotidie mihi augeſcit (.i. *augetur*) *magis de filio ægritudo.* Ter.

Paulatim rubeſcens roſa deliteſcit, Plin. *vide* Goclen. Prob. l. 1. pag. 38. 39.

Is Dormito *a frequentatiue verbe?*

It is by termination, and deriuation, but not by ſignification: *dormito* ſignifies in latine what ῥυχάζω doth in greeke, To take a nap, or to ſleepe dogs ſleepe; *Dormito deſiderium potius ſomni, aut leuiculum ſomnum, quam frequentem indicat,* ſaith *Peter Ramus, l.* 16. *Schol. Gram.* and in that of *Horace,*

25867

race, Quandoq; bonus dormitat Homerus: Quandoq;, is a signe both of diminution and frequency, and so takes away the signification of frequency from *dormito*.

Whence hath Coniugation its name?

A coniugando: because in euery Conjugation after one, and the same manner of varying of finall terminations many verbes are ioyned, as it were vnder the same *iugum*, or yoake.

Haue all verbs of the first Coniugation a *long before* re *and* ris?

No: for *Do*, and some of its compounds: as, *Pessundo, circundo*, make *dăre. Circundăre, Pessundăre. Stockwood*, and the Poser of the *Accidence*, adde *secundo*; *secundăre*: but this is not a compound of *Do*. *Secundo*, signifies to make prosperous, deriued of *secundus*, prosperous, fauourable, and hath *u* long.

To these may be also added, *venundare*, of *venum & dare*, as I suppose.

If all verbs be of the first Coniugation, which haue a *long before* re *and* ris, *then it seemes*, docēare, docēaris; audiare, audiaris, *be of the first Coniugation?*

The

The meaning of that is, not that all verbes that in any moode haue *a* long before *re* and *ris*, be of the first Coniugation, but such as haue *a* long before *re* in the infinitiue moode of the actiue forme, as *amare*, and before *ris* in the second person of the present Tense of the indicatiue moode of the passiue forme: as *gratularis*, are of the first Coniugation.

Why doe you say of the actiue, and passiue forme, and not of the actiue and passiue voyce?

Because there be many verbes neuter which are not actiue, and yet in coniugation follow the forme of the actiue verbes, and many verbes deponent, which though they be not passiue in signification, yet in cõiugation follow the forme of the passiue verbs.

Vpon *As in Præsenti.*

The verbe Lauo, *which* Lilly *saith, is of the first Coniugation, makes* lauĕre *in the Infinit. the last syllable sane one short; and* strideo, caveo, ferveo, *making* fervere, stridere, cavere, *are found*

25867

with e short before re in the infinitive of the second Conjugation?

'Tis true: but *lauĕre* is not of *lauo, lauas*, but of *Lauo luis*, which was of the third conjug. amongst the Ancients, and so vsed by *Virgil* in his *Georgicks* and *Aeneids*, and *fernere*, and *stridere* are found with e short; but thus conjugated, they are now growne out of vse; we are not to imitate the old Authors in these words.

Doth spondeo *geminate the first syllable in the* præteritum, *and make* spospondi?

No: herein *Lilly* was deceiued, and deceiued the Poser of the *Accidence*, and the Construer of *Lillies* rules, who transcribe it so: in the refined copies of the most incorrupt Authors, *spondeo* is found to make the *præteritum spopondi*, not *spospondi*. *

Is crepo *found of the third coniugation, as* Lilly *affirmeth?*

No: the pure Writers, who are to bee our Presidents, vse it in the first conjugation: *Intestina tibi crepant.* Plaut. *Quis post vina grauem militiam, & pauperiem crepat.* Hor. *Is*

* *Pansa aut morte, aut victoria se satisfacturum Reip. spopondit.* Cic. *Dependendum tibi est, quod mihi pro illo spopondisti.* Idem.

Is quiniſco *found in any good author?*

No: the true verbe is *conquiniſco*, which is a ſimple verbe, and ſo ſet downe by *Nebriſſenſis*, and *Ramus*, not a compound of *con*, and *quiniſco*, as *Lilly* imagined, any more then *condio*, or *conſulo*, &c.

Is nexo, nexis, nexui, *read in the third coniugation, as* Lilly *tels vs?*

No: it is onely read in the firſt coniugation, *nexo, nexas, nexare.*

Is cambio campſi *found in any pure author?*

No: it is a barbarous word, not to be vſed by any that would write pure latine; it is onely found in the old Grammarian *Priſcian.*

Doth Præcurro *make* Precucurri *in the* preterium?

No: it can ſcarce be ſo found in any good author.

Doth tracto alwaies *in compoſition change the firſt vowell into* e?

No: for we read *retracto: vulnera cruda retractat. Ouid. Pedamenta retractare. Columel.* So likewiſe *Pertracto.*

25867

cto. Pertractare Philosophiam. Cic.

Doth habeo *always in compositiō change the first vowell into* i, *as* Lilly *saith?*

No: for we read *posthabeo*: as, *posthabeo fama pecuniam*, in the Syntaxis.

Is exculpo *a compound of* ex *and* sculpo?

It seemes rather to be compounded of *ex* and *sculpo*: for the simple word *sculpo* is in vse, as *Ouid. Arte Mira sculpsit ebur.*

Is vulsum regularly formed of *velli*: according to that, *Dat velli vulsum.*

It seemes rather to be formed of the other *preteritum* of *vello* viz. *vulsi.*

How is that rule of Lilly *to be vnderstood,* Verba in or admittunt ex posteriore supino præteritum.

It is to be vnderstood of such verbs whose actiues haue the latter supine, of the which the preterperfectense passiue may be formed.

What then shall wee say concerning verbes deponent, and commune, which end in or, *and haue a preterperfect tense, which they cannot forme of a latter supine;*

supine : since they haue no verbs actiue?

Lilly doth say nothing of this point. I am of opinion that verbs actiue are to be fained, of whose latter supine these verbs would regularly forme their preterperfect tense, if such actiues were in vse: as for example, suppose that there were such a verbe as *lato, latas, latani*, of the latter supine of this verbe *latatu*, regularly shall be formed, *latatus sum, vel fui.* So likewise of the supine *criminatu*, of the fained verbe *crimino, nas:* wee may forme the *preteritum*, *criminatus, sum.*

What is the meaning of that verse in Grammer? Mæreo sum mæstus sed Phocæ nomen habetur.

That the neutropassiue verbe *mœreo* hath *mæstus sum* for its *preteritum*, but the Grammarian *Phocas* did think *mæstus* rather to be a noune: this verse might very well be spared.

Of Gerunds.

Whence hath a Gerund its name?

Quod

25867

Quòd rei gerendæ, & administrandæ exprimat significationem. Becauſe it expreſſeth the ſignification of a thing to be done, or executed. Some would haue the name to be giuen *a gerendo duplici ſignificatione, nempe actiua & paſſiua ſub vna voce:* but ſince there are ſo few Gerunds that ſignifie paſſiuely, and thoſe which doe, almoſt all growne out of vſe, I thinke that is not the reaſon of the name: in this, and many other tearmes of art we are left to diuine of the reaſons of the impoſition of the names.

Is that generally true which wee finde in the Engliſh *Rudiments. Gerunds haue both the actiue and paſſiue ſignification: as,* amandi *of louing, or being loued:* amando, *in louing, or in being loued:* amandum, *to loue, or to be loued?*

No: the greateſt part of Gerunds are vſed actiuely, very few paſſiuely; and in that kinde of vſe, there ſeemes to be an Archaiſme.

Of

Of the Supines.

Doth the latter ſupine ſignifie paſſiuely onely, for the moſt part as is in the Accidence?

No: it is alwaies of a paſſiue ſignification.

Of a Participle.

Since there are in truth but three tempora *of Participles*, præſens, præteritum, futurum, *is it proper to ſay*, Tempora participiorum ſunt quatuor, *by ſubdiuiding the future into the participle in* rus, *of the actiue, and neutrall ſignification; and the participle in* dus, *of the paſſiue ſignification?*

I thinke no: *Lilly* might as well haue ſaid, as I ſuppoſe, there be fiue *tempora*, foraſmuch as the participles of the future tenſe of a verbe actiue, and a verbe neuter ending in *rus*, doe differ in time as much among themſelues, as a participle of the future tenſe of a verbe paſſiue doth from either

25867

ther of them: if the actiue and passiue signification do distinguish their *times*, hee might then haue said in his diuision of *Tenses*, *Tempora sunt sex, præsens, imperfectum & futurum duplex, actiua, & passiua vocis*: nay, hee might haue said, *Tempora sunt decem quinque actiua, quinque passiua vocis*: but of this let the iudicious passe sentence. I speake with submission.

If in that example of the Accidence, Legendis veteribus proficis, *a participle of the future in* dus, *haue the signification of a participle of the present tense: how is it that* Lilly *in his Syntaxis, saith that in a like example a Gerund is turned into a noune adiectiue: as,* Cur adeo delectaris criminibus inferendis?

Truth is but one, on which side truth weighs heauier, I leaue to Grammarians to determine.

Doth a perfect verbe neuter forme onely two participles regularly, one of the present tense, and another of the future in rus?

Yes: for though we read *vigilandus, carendus*, participles in *dus*, and *triumphatus*

phatus, regnatus: but ſome of theſe and the like may be ended in a manner irregular, vſed onely by the Poets, whom it is not ſafe in all things to imitate.

But it ſeemes that regularly there come of ſome neutrals three participles; as of gaudeo, gaudens, gauiſus, gauiſurus: *of* audeo, audens, auſus, auſurus; fido, fidens, fiſus, fiſurus, &c.

Thoſe of which onely two participles come, muſt be onely neutrals; ſuch are not theſe: for theſe are *neutro paſſiues*, which ſince they differ from them in the manner of coniugation, no maruell if they differ from them in forming their participles.

Why are they called Neutro-paſſiues?

Becauſe though they be neuters, yet they forme a *Præteritum*, after the manner of verbs paſſiue.

How doe neutro-paſſiues, and paſſiue-neutrals differ?

Neutro-paſſiues, although they haue the preterperfect tenſe of paſſiues, yet they retaine the ſignification

25867

on of neuters; as, *soleo, solitus sum*, but passiue neutrals, though they end in o, yet they haue a passiue signification, and gouern the same case that passiues doe, as *vagulo, exulo.*

But it seemes there be some participles of the passiue voyce, which come of verbs neuter; for wee read, excursus, aratus, laboratus excurrendus arandus, laborandus.

These are formed of impersonall neuters, which are onely found in the third person of the passiue voice, but when Grammer saith, that onely two participles are formed of neuters, it meanes personall neuters of the actiue forme.

Are not verbs and participles of the actiue signification sometimes vsed passiuely, & contrà?

Yes; as for example, *Voluens pro volutus*, as *Turneb.* 30. *Aduersar.* 19. saith: *Certè hinc Romanos olim voluentibus annis. Virg.* 1. *Æn. Sparsus pro spargens. Priùs haustus sparsus aquarum ore fore. Virg.* 4. *Geor.* So *Cerda. Velata pro velans. Senec. in Herc. Æt.*

Æt.

Æt. sc. Flete. Adesq; sequi iussa sagittas Totum pennis velata diem. Plaut. in Mil. Glorios. sc. satin'. *Ira leniunt .i. leniuntur.* Virg. 2. Æneid. *Insinuat pro insinuatur*, as *Seruius* conceiues. *Tum vero tremefacta nouis per pectora cunctis Insinuat panor.* idem. *vertere pro versa sunt. Et tota in solidam glaciem vertere lacuna.* vide *Robig. Dict. Critic. l.* 11. *c.* 7.

Of Aduerbs.

Are not minus *and* male *aduerbs of denying?*

Yes, though they bee omitted by Lilly: *Minus pro non in Varro. Non mirum si cacutis minus, aurum enim non perstringit oculos. Si minus intelligitur*, if men vnderstand not. *Cic.* So *male.* Petron. *Quas struxit opes male sustinet. Malè sanus*, not well in his wit. *Male sobrius*, not sober.

Doe not two negatiue aduerbs denie more strongly sometimes in latine, as well as in greeke?

Yes: So, *Virg.* 2. *Georg.*

25867

Non ego cuncta meis amplexi versibus opto.

Non mihi si linguæ centum sint, oraque centum.

Et Æneid. 6. Ne pueri, ne tanta animis assuescite bella. Tull. 7. Epist. 1. Hæc tibi ridicula videntur, non n. ades quæ si videres, lacrymas non teneres, non.

Doe not particles of denying sometimes imply an affirmation, & contrà?

Yes: as for example, *Virg. 2. Geor. Et pro neque. Nec scabie, & falsa ladit rubigine ferrum. Et pro Sed. Cic. Mutorum causas non granatè & gratuito defendere.* So *Senec. Oratio ostendit illum non esse syncerum, & habere aliquid ficti. Aut pro nec. Vir. 4. Æn. Sed nullis ille movetur fletibus, aut vocos ullas tractabiles audit. Neque pro &, Virg. 5. Ecl. Nulla neque amnem Libavit quadrupes nec graminis attigit herbam. Iuvenal. Sat. 5. Omnia Græcè. Cum sit turpe magis nostris nescire latinè:* where in *nescire* the verbe *sciunt* is to be vnderstood, which belongs to *omnia Græce* before. *Mart. 5. Ep. 53. Exprimere Ane Latinum*, χαῖρε *non potes*,

potes Graecum: where in *non potes, potes*, which belongs to the former comma is to be vnderstood: so *Ter. Andr.* 13 *Deesse vobis terre in qua viuimus, in qua moriemur non potest. Idem. Andr.* 12. *Agrippina filia dare imperium, tolerare non peritantem nequibat*: out of *nequibat, quibat* is to be supplied. *Robig. Dist. Crit. l.* 12. c. 12.

Lilly *makes* sit ita, sit sane *aduerbs of granting*, id est, hoc est, quasi dicas, *aduerbs of explaning: are they aduerbs in truth?*

No: euery aduerbe is a simple single word, these are sentences, they belong to the Syntaxis, not Etymologie.

Of Coniunctions.

Is not it a contradiction in adiecto, *to say, a coniunction disiunctiue?*

No: for a coniunction disiunctiue conioynes the words, by disioyning the matter.

Doth Lilly speake logically, when he saith Iunt dictiones que nunc aduerbia, nunc coniunctiones, nunc præpositiones esse inueniuntur vt cum.

25867

No: for there is no other word of that nature, except *Come*. He herein ſpeaks like that Grammarian, who made this rule in *ol*, maſc. *Sunt vt Sol.* whereas it ſhould haue run thus, *in ol vnicum maſculinum eſt, vt Sol.*

Is que *alwayes an Enclitick?*

No: wee finde it ſometimes put before the word it couples, as that Epitaph of *Tibullus*.

Hic iacet immiti conſumptus morte Tibullus,
Meſſalam terra dùm ſequitur, que mari.

And in *Virg. Ipſe ego cana legam tenera lanugine mala. Caſtaneas, que nuces.* i. *Caſtaneas & nuces. Caſtanea*, and *nuces* are diſtinguiſhed, as ſaith *Plinie*, *l.*15.*c.*28. and ſo they are here too, as *Scal.* thinke. *de C. LL. l.*12. *c.* 177. *Ouid. l.* 2. *de Arte*, alluding to this verſe, makes a diſtinction betwixt them:

Affert aut vuas, aut quas Amacillis amabit,
Et nunc caſtaneas, nunc amat illa nuces.

Of a Prepoſition.

Did Lilly *doe well to handle the regimen of Prepoſitions in Etymologie.*

No: herein he confounds Etymologie and Syntaxis.

Of an Interiection.

Why is an Interiection ſo called?

Quod interijciatur: becauſe it is *caſt in* as a ſodaine eiaculation, expreſſing in an abrupt faſhion, ſome paſſion of the minde.

Of SYNTAXIS.

WHence hath Syntaxis its name?

From the Greeke word σύν, *con*, and τάξις *ordinatio*: becauſe therein is ſet out the fit and regular coordination, and ſtructure of ſimple words in clauſes and ſentences.

25867

Of the first Concord.

What doe you thinke of the second exception from verbum personale, *viz.* Impersonalia præcedentem, &c.

I thinke it might be spared as well as the first: either this place is improper to treate of impersonals, or else there is a tautologie in repeating the same rule afterward; nay, to speak truth, this exception is absurd: it is in effect thus much; all verbes personall agree with their nom. cases in number and person, except verbes impersonall, which are altogether vncapable of a nominatiue case before them, which is plaine *non-sence*.

Are not nounes which are not collectiues sometimes construed as if they were such?

Yes: as for example; *Plautus in Bacchidis Servi. Maxume. Et ego (Chrysalus) hic, & illum meditamus infortunio*: the Pronoune *ego* here is comprehensiue, as if *Chrysalus* being one, did oppose himselfe against two, and that hee might

might match them, he ſpeaks of himſelfe as of two. *Scal. de Cauſ. L. L. l. 6. c. 30. Virg. 9. Æneid. Vos o Calliope precor aſpicate canenti. Alcmena in Plaut. Amph. Sc. Satin.* ſpeaking to *Amphitruo* alone ſaith: *Quis igitur niſi vos.* The perſon of a King repreſents many: thence that forme, *Nos Iacobus Dei gratia, &c. mandamus.*

Is not ſometimes the number of the verbs varied in the ſame comma, though referred to the ſame thing?

Yes: ſo we read in *Tully, ad Att. l. 1. Ep. 2. Nunc fac vt ſciam quo die te viſuri ſumus.*

Of the ſecond Concord.

May not an adiectiue put after two ſubſtantiues of diuers genders, or numbers ſometimes agree with the latter, as well as with the former?

Yes: the adiectiue may ſometimes indifferently accord with either of the ſubſtantiues; for we finde in *Tully, Non omnis error ſtultitia eſt dicenda:* and

25867

in *Liuy, Gens vniuerſa veneti appellati.*

Is not an adiectiue ſometimes put alone (as it were a ſubſtantiue) whoſe ſubſtantiue is to be vnderſtood and ſupplied?

Yes: and that very elegantly: ſo we reade, *tribuo tibi primas.* i *primas partes. Amplecti ambabus.* i. *ambabus manibus: Aſpergere frigida.* i. *frigida aqua:* it is an immitation of the Greekes, who ſay πρὸς ὀρθὴν .i. γραμμὴν *ad rectam .i. lineam,* ἀπὸ μιᾶς φωνῆς, *ab vna .i. voce.*

What if two adiectiues concur together in the ſame ſentence?

Then one of them putteth on the nature of a ſubſtantiue: *Crudelem medicum intemperans ager faeit:* here *ager* is taken ſubſtantiuely.

If that the adiectiue is to agree with the ſubſtantiue in caſe, gender, and number, what thinke you of theſe examples which ſeeme to ouerthrow that rule, eſt quod ſperemus Deos bonis benefacturum. Aruſpices dixerunt omnia ex ſententia proceſſurum. Non putaui hæc eam facturum?

Peter

Peter Ramus in his Grammaticall Scholia's ſaith, that in theſe, and in ſuch like examples, thoſe wordes which ſeeme to be Participles, are indeed verbs of the infinitiue moode and future tenſe of the actiue forme, hauing *eſſe* vnderſtood: *in cuius ſententiam pedibus eo.*

Is that true latine in Plautus, *where he calls* Venus, *Deum indignam?* *In Pen. in Scen. Dij illum.*

Yes: the Heathen did thinke all their gods were both Male and Female, according to that of *Orpheus.*

Ζεὺς ἄρσην γίνετο, Ζεὺς ἄμβροτος ἔπλετο νύμφη.

Iupiter & mas eſt, & neſcia fœmina mortis.

So *Venus*, and other goddeſſes haue the title *Deus* giuen to them: ſo *Virg. l. 2. Æneid. Deſcendo, ac ducente Deo flammam inter, & hoſtes Expedior.* Macrob. Sat. 3. c. 7. ſaith, it is ſo to bee read, *Idem Æneid. 2. Pollentemq; Deum Venerem.* *Seruius* and *Acterianus* doe approue of that reading. *Heu fortuna quis eſt crudelior in nos Te Deus.* Hor. 2. Ser. 8. *Lucret. l. 2.*

Ter-

25867

Terram Deum matrem appellat. Sequitur superbos victor à tergo Deus à Nemesis. Senec. *Virg. Æneid. 7. Alecto Deus appellatur. Nec dextræ erranti Deus abfuit.* In like manner *Iustinian* for his effeminateneſſe was called *Vxorius*: and *Liuia* for her wiſedome was ſtiled, *Stolatus Vlyſſes.* Suet. *vide Rebig. Lex. Crit. l. 4. c. 17.*

Are not two or three adiectiues ſometimes ioyned to one ſubſtantiue?

Yes: as for example. *Criſpi ſulcans igneum fulmen.* Cic. *Ob egregiam inſignem fidem.* Idem. *Ad domeſtica eximia eius fiducia acta veniamus.* Val. Max. *Sanctiſſimus genealis torus.* Idem. *Pulcherrima prepes Læua volauit auis.* Ennius apud Cic. de Diuin.

Are not ſomtimes two adiectiues coupled together, vſed for one?

Yes: as for example. *Sarta-tecta precepta.* Plaut. *Purus-purus aſinus.* Varro apud Nonium. *Novum-vetus vinum bibo.* Varro. *Nouo-veteri morbo medeor.* Idem. So, *Deus optimus-maximus. Graio-Greci.* Ennius apud Feſtum. *Ruta-cæſa.* apud Ieſ.

Of

Of the third Concord.

If the Relative agree with the Antecedent, in Gender, Number, and Person; how is it that we finde in Terence. Vbi eſt ille ſcelus, qui me perdidit? Qui *the Relative is of the maſcul. gender, and* ſcelus *the Antecedant of the neuter?*

Scelus is here put for *ſceleſtus*, as elſewhere *Seminus* for *Senex* by a Metonymie of the adjunct; ſo the ſenſe is made good: or *qui* by the figure *Hypozeuxis* hath reference to *ſceleſtus*, to ber vnderſtood in *ſcelus* by the iudicious Readers.

In that example; Eſt locus in carcere, quod Tullianum appellatur, *and the like*; *as*, Bene audiri, qui eſt recte factorũ fructus omnes ferre volumus: *and*; Hodie, quæ eſt altera dies Pentecoſtes, venit ad me nuntius, *where the Relative put betweene two Subſtantiues, agrees with the latter, is the conſtruction proper to the Latines?*

No: it is an imitation of the greeks, who

who haue the ſame conſtruction. So *Iſocrates*, λόγοι ἐν ἔπεσιν ἡμῖν εἰσὶ αἷς ἐλπίδας ὀνομάζομεν: and thus *Tully*. *Ne appellaueris conſilium, quæ vis, ac neceſſitas appellanda eſt.*

What doe you thinke of that example: Noſtros vidiſti flentis ocellos?

In it there is a ſolæciſme, or at leaſt a ſolæcophanes, the Poet ſhould haue ſaid regularly, if his verſe would haue ſuffered him, either *noſtros flentium*, or *meos flentis*, to make vp the conſtruction: we muſt vnderſtand in *noſtros*, *meos*, in *meos mei*. vide *Goclen. Prob. Gram. l. 3. p. 131.*

Is Imperium, & dignitas quæ petiſti; *a fit example of that rule in the Engliſh Syntaxis: many Antecedents ſingular hauing a coniunction copulatiue betweene them, will haue a relatiue plurall, which relatiue ſhall agree with the Antecedent of the moſt worthy Gender?*

No: for here the relatiue agrees with the antecedent of the moſt vnworthy gender, *viz.* the Neuter. Againe, if this bee a true example, that exception ſubjoyned of Things without

out life is superfluous, for it is an exception to it selfe; for to speake truth, to that rule doth this example appertaine *Imperium*, and *Dignitas* being things without life: of that rule many Antecedents, &c. this or the like example should haue beene giuen. *Rex, & Regina, quos tu beatos prædicas, sunt mortales.*

Is that example; Felix quem faciunt aliena pericula cautum, *properly rendred in English?*

No: it should not haue beene rendred; *Happy is he &c. to beware*: for *cautum* is not here the first supine of *caueo*, neither can be (for it is not put after a verbe, signifying mouing to a place, but an adjectiue) the verse should therefore haue beene thus translated: *Happy is hee whom others harmes make wary.*

Of the construction of Noune Substantiues.

Doth not a Substantiue sometimes gouerne two genitiue cases, or more?

Yes:

25867

Yes: wee reade in Cicero. *Iamne sentis bellua, qua sit hominum querela frontis tua?* where *querela* gouernes *hominum*, and *frontis*. *Sed qua naturæ principia sint societatis humanæ repetendum altius videtur.* idem. *Procreatio Dei rerum humanarum.* *Aristotelis Philosophorum Principis arcanorum naturæ theoremata.*

Are not two substantiues sometimes linked together by a line, which the Grãmarians call Hyphen, *vsed for one?*

Yes: such wordes are found amongst the Lawyers; as, *Placitum-consensum.* Vlpian. *Munus-donum.* Modest. *Actio-petitio.* Callistrat. *Locatio-conductio.* Labeo. *Obiurgator-censor.* Macrob.

Is not a woorde in it selfe a compownd, and so one, sometimes diuided in respect of construction?

Yes: as in this example. *Neq; ille magis iurisconsultus quam institus fuit.* The word *Iurisconsultus* is one in it selfe, but to be diuided in the rection of *institia.*

Are not adiectiues of the masculine

or

or feminine gender vſed ſometimes ſubſtantiuely, as well as adiectiues of the neuter gender?

Yes: 1. *Male.* as, *die natalis ſui.* Marc. *Humanus pro Homo.* Cic. ad Att. l. 3. ep. 21. *Ego autem tibi affirmo (poſſum falli vt humanus) à me non habere.* *Phaethon*, the epithite of the Sunne vſed ſubſtantiuely in Æneid. 5. ſaith Cerdo. *Auroram Phaethontis equi iam luce vehebant*, in Æneid. 1. *Imperium Dido Tyria regit vrbe profecta Germanum (.i. fratrem) fugiens.*

2. *Fœm.* Virg. 1. Æneid. *Implentur veteris Bacchi, pinguiſq; ferinæ .i.* carnis ferinæ, Senec. 1. de Benef. 5. *Imperator aliquem torquibus, mureli, & civica donat .i. corona.* & Plin. l. 8. *Nigra lanarum nullum colorem bibunt.*

3. *Neutr.* as, *Strata viarum. Amara curarum. Singula capitum. Profunda camporum. Præruptæ collium. Montium arduæ, opacæ locorum, &c.*

Are not ſometimes ſubſtantiues put in the place of adiectiues?

Yes: ſo, *Nihil pro Nullo apud Vlpianum.* & Virg. Æneid. 1.

Re-

25867

Regales inter mensas, laticemque
Lyæum à. Bacchicum.

Doe not some substantiues verball gouerne the same case that their verbs doe, of which they are derined?

Yes: as for example; wee reade *exul à patria*, as well as *exultat à patria*; *Discessus ab vrbe*, as well as *discedere ab vrbe*, We reade *obtemperare legibus*, and *institutæ est obtemperatio scriptis legibus*: in *Tully* we reade in euery classicall Author, *Capite diminui, præfici prætorio*, and *Iulius Scaliger* hath; *Capite diminutio*. Suetonius, *Præfectus prætorio*. Wee reade *domum eo, redeo*, and *domum itio, reditio*, in Cæsar. *Faueo authoritati &, fautor authoritati. Nascor à muliere, &, natiuitas à muliere: erudior à magistro; &, ab optimo magistro optima iuuentutis eruditio.*

Vide Rod. Goclen. obseru. Linguæ Lat. p. 126.

What substantiues gouerne an ablatiue case with the preposition Cum?

Such as signifie societie, conjunction, and friendship, as, *Amicitia, familiaritas, consuetudo cum aliquo.*

Ci-

Ciceronis cum Dionysio magna intercessit familiaritas.

Is not Opus *read construed with an ablatiue case of the participle of the preter tense?*

Yes, and that very elegantly: as for example, *Priusquam incipias consulto, & ubi consuleris mature facto opus est*, Salust. *Opus est maturato*, Liuie. *Quod parato opus est para*, Terence. *Opus est viso, & cauto*, Plautus.

Of the construction of Adiectiues.

May an adiectiue in the neuter gender put substantiuely, gouerne any other adiectiue also, put substantiuely in the genitiue case?

No: no adjectiue put as a substantiue, can gouerne another adjectiue which is declined with three articles, but onely such a one as is varied by three terminations, therefore we may say: *Aliquid mali, aliquid absurdi, honesti, boni*, we cannot

25867

say, aliquid vtile, aliquid impossibile &c. neither can we say, *Nihil satis* for *Nihil vale*.

Doth Lilly speake properly, when hee expresseth certaine nouns of number by certa numeralia?

No; he speakes barbarously; for *certus* is neuer put for *quidam* in any good and classicall Writer.

What doe you thinke of that rule, Comparatiua & superlatiua accepta partitiuè genitivum, vnde & genus sortiuntur, exigunt?

This rule is good; It had beene well *Lilly* would haue furnished vs with some examples of it; in these which follow, his defect shall bee supplied. *Ignis omnium elementorum est efficacissimum, & violentissimum. Supremus, extremusq; omnium affectuum in femina est zelotypia. Finis causarum omnium nobilissima est. Mors vltimum, summum, grauissimum, & acerbissimum omnium terribilium.*

In these speeches, Magnam partem consulatus tui abfui. Cic. Illud tibi assen-

afflictior. *Idem.* Menedemi vicem miseret. *Ter.* Solicitus vicem Imperatoris. *Liu.* Mœstus suam vicem. *Cæs.* Cætera bonus. *Cic.* *Why are partem, Illud vicem, cætera, the accusative case, and by what rule of Lilly?*

Lilly hath no rule to shewe the reason of this construction: it is in truth a greeke Atticisme: for the greekes put the accusatiue case after verbes, and adiectiues after that manner: *sic,* πρὸς μέρος ὀρχίζεσθαι, *vicem alicuius irasci,* ἡμᾶς ἀπώλεσας τὸν σὸν μέρος, *perdidisti nos quantum in te est.* ἅπασι σόφος, *omnibus sapiens.*

When is an adiectiue construed with an accusatiue case, with a preposition?

When Aptitude, propensitie, respect, obiect, or finall cause is signified, as,

Proclivis à labore ad libidinem.

Furtum ingeniosus ad omne.

Assuetus ad bellum. Rudis ad arma.

Studio eloquentiæ non aliud in civitate nostra, vel ad utilitatem fructuosius,

25867

vel ad dignitatem amplius, vel ad vrbis famam pulchrius, vel ad totius imperij, atq; omnium gentium notitiam illustrius excogitari potest. Quint. *Calcei habiles ad pedes.* Cic. *Aptus natus ad singularem dicendi facultatem.*

Is that example of adiectiua quæ ad copiam, *viz.* at fessæ referunt multa se nocte minores Crura thymo plena.

No: the Composer of the *English Rudiments*, and *Lelly* vnderstood not (as it seemes) *Virgils Syntaxis*, and therefore corrected the originall suspecting it to bee faultie: and the Construer of the Syntaxis so transcribes it, and translates it. But *Virgil* wrote not *plena*, but *plena*: the verse is thus to be construed: the lesser *Bees* doe returne home wearie late at night *(plena crura .i. habentes crura plena thymo)* Hauing their shankes full of thyme; in which there is a Synechdoche, or figure, often vsed by that excellent Poet, as

* *Ecl.* 1. *Sepes Hyb'æis apibus florem depasta salicti .i. habens florem depastū.* So likewise: *Os humerosq; Deo similis.* idē. So, *Faciem mutatus & ora .i. habens faciem mutatam*; or it maybe there is an imitation of the Greekes who in such speeches make an *ellipsis* of κατὰ.

Doe not adiectiues of comparing or exceeding, gouerne an ablatiue case of the word, which signifies the measure of exceeding, as well as verbes?

Yes: for wee may as well say, *Cicero præstantior est omnibus oratoribus multis gradibus*, as, *Cicero præstat omnes oratores multis gradibus.*

May not an adiectiue of the positiue degree with magis, *or* minus, *haue an ablatiue case after it, as well as one of the comparatiue?*

Yes: so *Terence* in *Eunucho. Hoc nemo fuit minus ineptus, nec magis seuerus quisquam* .i. *quam hic.* & Virg. *O luce magis dilecta sorori* .i. *quam lux.*

Of the construction of Pronounes.

Is not Meus, *and* Noster, *sometimes vsed passiuely?*

Yes: *Plaut. in Pœn. sc. Negetij Ecce odium meum.*

Quid me vis? pro, odium mei; twice in the same Scene.

25867

Cicero pro Roſc. Amer. *Hæc conficta arbitror à poetis eſſe vt effictos mores noſtros in alienos perſonis, expreſſamq; imaginam noſtram (i. noſtri) vitæ quotidianæ viderimus.*

Neq; minus eſt ſparrianus Ageſilaus ille prohibendus, qui ne quis pictum neq; fictam imaginem ſuam (i. ſui) paſſus eſt. Idem.

Et digna ſpecula ſint imago tua i. *tui. Mart.* This is to bee obſerued, not imitated.

Are not proper and appellatiue nounes ſometimes put in ſtead of pronounes?

Yes: *Plautus in Pœnul. ſtem. ſatis ſpectatum.* puts *Syncerastum pro me*, and *Tuus amicus*, for, *Ego.*

Milph. *Heus Synceraſte.* Sync. *Syncerastum quis vocat?*

Mi. *Tuus amicus.*

Is not Noſter *ſometimes put for* Meus & contrà?

Yes: as for example. *Noſtrum conſilium inire laudandum eſt quod meos cives ſeruis armatis obſeſſi noluerim. Cicer.* where *noſtrum* is put for *meum.* —*Stratiq; per herbam.*

His

Hic meus est dixere dies. Senec. in Suasor. 2. where *Meus* is put for *Noster.*

Are not relative pronouns sometimes put for reciprocall, & contra?

Yes: as for example. *Principio generi animantium omni est à natura tributum vt se, vitam, corpusq; tueatur, declinetq; que ei .i. Sibi nocitura videantur.* Cic.

Praceptor amat discipulos ipsum (.i. se) exercitantes.

Non potest vt illum (.i. se) miserum putetis. Quintil. Here relatiues are put for reciprocals.

Plaut. in Cupe. scen. Quo illum. Is est servus ipse, neq; præter se (.i. ipsum) unquam et servus fuit.

Respice Lagiten vt iam sua (.i. eius) lumina vendat.

Non ex oratione, sed suis ex moribus spectare debetis pro, erit. Cicer. here reciprocals are put for relatiues.

How are these two rules in Linacer, *and* Lilly *to bee reconciled.* Ipse ex pronominibus solum trium personarum

25867

narum ſignificationem repræſentat. *And*, Idem etiam omnibus perſonis iungi poteſt: *they ſeeme to contradict eaeh other.*

Thus. *Ipſe* onely of all thoſe pronounes, which truly and properly are propounes, or which are ſimple pronounes, doth repreſent the ſignification of three perſons: but *Idem* is no ſimple pronoune but a compound, not a naturall and genuine pronoune, but additicious, as *Lilly* ſaith: one of theſe diſtinctions muſt be admitted or elſe a manifeſt contradiction cannot be auoided.

If it bee true that onely ego, *and* nos, *be of the firſt perſon onely, as is ſet downe in the Engliſh Rudiments: and* Idem, *and* Ipſe, *doe repreſent the ſignification of three perſons, according to your diſtinction. How comes it to paſſe that we finde in* Tully, is, *in the firſt perſon, as,* Is nullo in loco prædonibus iam pares eſſe poteramus: *and in Liuie,* De pace agitur, agimuſque ij quorum & maxime intereſt pacem eſſe: *and,* Vidiſtis in vincula duci vniuerſi

uiuersi eum, qui a singulis vobis pericula depulerim.

Since the pronoune *idem* is vsed in three persons, which is compounded of *is*, & the syllabical particle *dem* I am of opinion that *is*, the simple pronoune may be vsed so likewise, as appeareth by the precedent examples.

Since wee may very easily erre in the vse of Pronounes reciprocall, what rules haue you to steare and direct vs in the right vse of them?

Diuers; for which you are beholden to *Rodolphus Goclenius*, in his obseruations of the Latine tongue, which for memory sake I will contract.

1. In a simple reciprocation i. such as is made with one verbe, a Pronoune of the first or second person is neuer added to the verbe, but alwayes one of the third: for we cannot say, *Ego fui secum*, but *cum eo*, nor, *Tu nauasti suum fratrem*, but *eius*.

2. A reciprocall pronoune reflects the

the action of the verbe vpon it selfe as the agent: as, *mulier sibi nimium placet* i. *sibi mulier.*

3. When the possessour workes vpon the thing possessed, or the thing possessed vpon the possessor, the possessiue *suus* is vsed: *Sæpe in magistros scelera redierunt sua. Senec.* and, *& sua riserunt sæcula Meomdem.*

4. In a compound reciprocation such as is made with many verbes, when the action of the verbe following is reflected vpon the person of the verbe afore going, it is expressed by *sui*, as *Cæsar rogat vt veniam ad se* i. *ad Cæsarem rogantem. Rogat vt ignoscam sibi* i. *sibi roganti.*

5. When in the construction of two verbes, the action of the latter verbe passeth vpon the person of the former, as the possessor, *suus* is vsed. *Rogat me vt suum* (id est ipsius qui rogat) *infantem filium.*

6. The actiue construction may be changed into the passiue by a reciprocall pronoune: as wee may say, *Antonium deseruerunt sui collegæ*, and

Ant.

Ager alterius est a suis colegis. Amat patrem filius suis, and, *Amatur pater a filio suo.*

Of the construction of Verbes.

Is the construction of the infinitive mode of a verbe substantive the same after a verbe personall and impersonall?

No: except an accusatiue case be expressed before the infinitiue of a verbe substantiue, which is gouerned of a verbe personall, the word which followes shall not be the accusatiue, but the nominatiue; as, wee cannot say, *Malo esse diuitem*, though *me* be vnderstood, but *malo esse diues*; but when *me* is expressed, wee say, *malo me esse diuitem*: but if an infinitiue be gouerned of a verbe impersonall, the word that follows the infinitiue, may be the accusatiue case, though the word comming before it be not expressed; for wee may say, *Iuuat*

esse

25867

esse disertes, as well as *Iuuat nos esse disertos*.

In those examples, Adolescentis est maiores natu reuereri; *and*, Regum est parcere subiectis, *is* est *a verb personall or impersonall?*

It is a verbe impersonall, and therefore these examples are misplaced, they belong to the first rule of impersonals, *Interest, refert, & est*, and there *Lilly* hath set downe a paralell example: *Prudentis est multa dissimulare*.

What rule have you for this construction, Commendo te virtutis, vitupero ignauiæ, castigo negligentiæ, miror prudentiæ, &c.

In these and the like, there is a *Græcisme, causa*, or *ergò*, is to be vnderstood, as ἕνεκα often amongst the Greekes: as μακαρίζω σε τῆς σοφίας ἕνεκα τῆς σῆς, *Beatum te prædico propter fidem*.

In that of Terence, Rerum suarum satagit; *why doth* satagit *governe a genetiue case?*

The genetiue case seemes to de-

pend

pend vpon the particle *sat*, in compoſition; and ſo the verbe being of it ſelfe a compound, and one; by reaſon of conſtruction is diuided.

What verbes gouerne a datiue caſe?

Theſe, and all of the like or contrary ſignification: *Commodo, compeno, noreo, do, comparo, redde, polliceor, ſoluo, confudo, obtempero, dico impero, & indigner, minor, ac iraſcor, adulor, &c.*

What kinde of datiue doe theſe commonly gouerne?

A datiue of the perſon, not of the thing, vnleſſe the thing take vpon it the nature of a perſon; as, *ponti indignatur Araxes.*

What prepoſitions be thoſe wherewith verbes compounded gouerne a datiue caſe?

Theſe in this hexamiter:

Ad, præ, con, ob, & in, ſimul hæ, poſt, ante, ſub, inter.

Doth not habeo *put for* eſt *gouerne a datiue caſe, as well as* eſt *for* habeo?

Yes: as for example, *Eſt mihi ludibrio, habeo illum ludibrio. Habeo voluptat*

25867

luptati literarum studia, literarum stu-dio sunt (mihi) voluptati.

Doth Præuimo *governe an accusa-tiue case, though it be compounded with* præ, *as* Lilly *teacheth vs.*

No: it is a barbarous word, not found in any pure writer, or Lexico-grapher.

If all verbes transitiue governe an accusatiue case, how is it that we reade in Plautus, Consequor *with a dative, as,* Voluptati meror vt comes consequitur?

In this there is a grecisme, for the Greekes vse ἕπομαι *sequor*, with a da-tiue, as ἕπεσθαι τῇ ἡδονῇ: so they say, φθονῶ σοί: and *Plautus* elsewhere, *dolere alicui*: and *Cicero* hath the like grecisme, *Comitari huic via.*

Doe any verbes of asking governe an ablatiue case without a præpo-sition?

No: and therefore these words, *cum præpositione* should be added to that rule, *verba rogandi interdum mu-tant alterum, &c.*

In that example, Est virtus placi-

tis

tis abstinuisse bonis: *is* bonis *the dative case, as* Lilly informes vs?

Linacer de Emend. struct. Lat. 9, 267. *l.* 4. saith it is the ablatiue case, and I rather side with him.

In that example, Deforme existimabat quos dignitate præstaret, ab ijs virtutibus superari: *doth either of those verbes gouerne an ablatiue case of the measure of exceeding, according to the rule?*

No: those verbes doe gouerne an ablatiue case of the matter of excesse, not of the measure of exceeding, this or the like example would better fit the rule, *Multis parasangis omnes oratores præcurrit Cicero.*

Of an Adiectiue gouerning three ablatiue cases.

Can any one adiectiue gouerne three ablatiue cases, according to three seuerall rules in Grammer?

Yes: as in this example, *Oxonia est insignior Louanio literarum studijs multis parasangis.*

Of

25867

Of Verbes gouerning diuerſe of the ſame caſes by ſeuerall rules of Grammer.

Can you giue an example of a verbe gouerning three datiue caſes?

Yes: as for example, *Neroni (.i. a Nerone) probis viris crimini vertitur innocentia.*

Can any one verbe gouerne fiue ablatiue caſes, according to the rules of Grammer?

Yes: as for example; *Ab artifice arte fabrili ſumma diligentia politis pedibus ex vlmeo ligno lectulos fieri iuſſit Titius.*

Can a verbe gouerne three ablatiue caſes with three prepoſitions.

Yes: as for example; *Accuſatur de furto a vicino ſummo cum rigore.*

Of

Of the Conſtruction of the Infinitiue Moode.

If two verbes come together, ſhall the latter be alwayes of the Infinitiue moode?

No: ſometimes two verbes are ioyned together in the ſame tenſe and number by an Hyphen. as, *quemnam te eſſe dicam-feram. Varro apud Nonium. Reddas-reſtituas*, amongſt the Lawyers. *Qui fecerit ſculpſerit Modeſtinus:* ſo *Vtimini-fcruimini*, whence the ſubſtantiue *vſus fructus.*

May not ſometimes two verbes of the infinitiue moode be ioyned together?

Yes: as for example, *Ter. in And. Sc. Adhuc. Dare bibere:* and *dixit Iureconſultus non oportere ius ciuile calumniari neque verba captare, ſed qua mente quid diceretur animaduertere conuenire.* So *Dico vti frui licere.*

Is not the infinitiue moode ſometimes vſed as well for the preſent tenſe of the

25867

Indicatiue, as for the preter tense, or preterimperfect tence?

Yes: as for example, *Virg. Æneid.* 10. — *Multi seruare recursus, Languentis pelagi, & brevibus se credere saltu.* where *seruare* is put for seruant, *credere* for *credunt*. So *Ouid. 4. Metam.* — *Rutulis collucent ignibus ædes falsaque sauarum simulachra vlulare ferarum*: where *vlulare* is put for *vtulant*.

Salust. Rursus Imperator contra postulata Bocchi nuntios mittit, ille probare partem, alia abnuere, eo modo ab vtraque missis, remissisque nuntijs tempus procedere, & ex Metelli voluntate bellum intactum trahi: where *probare, abnuere, procedere, trahi*, are put for *probat, abnuit procedit, trahitur*.

Are not verbes of the infinite moode, as also verbes finite, vsed sometimes as nounes, and with the same construction.

Yes: as in these examples: First, Verbes finite are vsed as Nounes. *Tull. pro Mur. illud, licet consulere, perdidistis. Aue mihi dixit*. i. *salutem. Liu. l. 6. faxo, ne inuet vox ista veto*. i.

ne iuuet prohibitio. Plaut. in Pan. Sc. Negotij. Si tacuisses, iam istuc Taceo non natum foret. Sapientia vsque ad Plaudite viuendum, in Cat. Mai.

Secondly, verbes of the infinitiue moode are vsed for noumes. *Virg. in 9. Ille suo moriens dat habere nepoti. Cic. Inhibere illud tuum quod valde mihi arriserat, vehementer displicet. Pers. Sat. 1. Sed fas Tunc cum ad canitiem, & nostrum illud viuere triste. Aspexi:* where wee may note also that the prepositiō *ad* is præfixed before *viuere. Ipsum illud peccare quoque te verteris vnum est. Cic.*

Of construction by a Periphrasis.

Doe not pure latine Authors sometimes make a Periphrasis of a verbe, gouerne the same case which the verbe it selfe would dde?

Yes: as *Ter. Id studiose dat operam.* .i. *id curat. Id ne estis autores mihi?* .i. *idne suadetis mihi. Idem. Cæsar Senatui dicto audiens futurus* i. *obtem-*

25867

peraturus. Cic. Fac me has res certiorem .i. edoce me has res. Idem. Quid tibi hanc rem curatio est? .i. quid hanc rem curas. Plaut. Quid malum tibi istanc tactio est? .i. quid tangis eam. Idem.

Of construction by Apposition.

May not the word which might be put in the same case with the word wherewith it is ioyned by apposition be put in the datiue case?

Yes: and that very elegantly, as *Cui nunc cognomen Iülo. Virg. Est illi nomen Capitoni. Cic.*

Is it not necessary sometimes that in Apposition the same gender and number be obserued?

Yes: for we must say, *Voluptas perpetua comes summi boni*, not *perpetuus. Manus vltrix*, not *vltor*, *virtus assertrix*, not *assertor. Inuentrices literarum Athenæ*, not *Inuentores.*

What if the diuers gender of a nonne sub-

ſubſtantiue, whiob is called ſubſtantiuum mobile *.i. ſuch a one as is varied in termination, and ſex, as* Magiſter, & magiſtra, diſcipulus, diſcipula *be to be ioyned by Appoſition with a word of the neuter gender, is it to be vſed in the maſculine, or in the feminine gender?*

In the maſculine, as the more worthy; as *Tempus Magiſter artium, & diſcipulus rerum*, not *diſcipula*, or *magiſtra*, but if the ſubſtantiue to be coupled be not *ſubſtantiuum mobile*, ſometimes a noune of the feminine gender may be added, as *verbum nota animi, vitium labes animi.* Sometimes of the maſculine, as *vinum abſynthites, vel aromatites .i. aromatibus conditum.*

When may ſubſtantiues coupled in the ſame caſe by Appoſition be of diuers numbers?

Either when one of the ſubſtantiues wants the plurall or ſingular number, as *Diuitiæ gluten amicorum. Paſſer deliciæ:* or is a noune collectiue, as *Angeli agmen forte:* or

25867

some one single thing either ioyned with others, or multiplied, is signified, as *Nata mea vices. Vxor mea gaudia. Pulmones instrumentum* (not *instrumenta*) *respirationis*: for there is but one lung in a liuing creature, but the ancients said *pulmones* in the plurall number, because that part of the body which drawes in, and lets forth the breath is cleft, as the hoof of an Oxe.

Are substantiues ioyned by Apposition alwaies put in the same case?

No: the latter substantiue which doth explaine or declare the former is sometimes put in the ablatiue case, and the word explained in the genetiue or datiue; as, *Vinis Patauij vrbi scientiarum laude celeberrima. Roma lupinari communi habitas. Oxonia Academia clarissima crematus est Cranmerus. Lacedamoni oppido insigni senibus maximus habebatur.*

Of

Of the conſtruction of Gerunds and Supines.

Is that rule generally true, Gerunds and Supines gouerne the ſame caſe that the verbes that they come of?

No: it is to be vnderſtood onely of gerunds ſignifying actiuely, and the firſt ſupines: for gerunds which ſignifie paſſiuely, and the latter ſupines are ſcarce to be found with any caſes after them.

How may this, and the like Engliſh phraſes be rendred in Latine, viz. *I came in dinner time.*

Very elegantly by the gerund in *dum*, with the prepoſition *inter*; as, *veni inter prandendum.*

In theſe formes of ſpeech, accuſatum oportuit factum oportet: volo datum; *how may it appeare* that accuſatum, factum, datum, *are participles, not ſupines?*

Thus: becauſe wee finde participles varied in all genders in this

25867

forme of ſpeech, whereas ſupines want all genders, and flexion. *Ter. in Heauton. Interemptam oportuit, & in Andr. Nonne prius communicatum oportuit. Sic, cupio hunc defenſum, & hanc defenſam.* Here the verbe *eſſe* is to be ſupplied.

What doe you thinke of theſe ſupines, Do venum, do nuptum, *which* Lilly *ſaith haue* latentem motum?

* *Nubit vxor, ducit vxorem vir.*

Nuptum ſignifies* paſſiuely: *do nuptum*, I giue in marriage, or to be married. It is queſtinable whether *venum* be a ſupine of *veneo*, or an aduerbe like to *peſſum*; the analogie ſeemes to inſinuate ſo much; as wee ſay *peſſundare*, and *peſſum dare*; ſo wee ſay *venundare*, and *venum dare*, *ſed de hoc ampliandum eſt.*

In thoſe examples, Actum eſt, Itum eſt, Ceſſatum eſt, *is the firſt ſupine put abſolutely with the verbe* eſt, *as* Lilly *tels vs?*

No: herein hee is fouly deceiued, hee might as well ſay, *placitum*

eſt

eſt, libitum eſt, puditum eſt, &c. are Supines, which he affirms are Verbs impersonall of the passiue voyce, in his rules of Etymologie, touching Impersonals, and such are these also.

Of Place.

Is that rule : Omne verbum admittit genitiuum proprij nominis loci in quo fit actio, &c. *true, concerning all proper names of places of the first, or second declension, and singular number?*

No: it extends only to proper names of Cities, and Townes, not to vast Regions: for wee may not say, *Numidiæ acriter pugnatum eſt*, but in *Numidia.*

By what rule of Lillies *Syntaxis, is* terra-marique *the ablatiue case, in that of Cicero;* Quantas ille res terra, mariquegesserat?

There is not any rule for that manner of construction, but it is of kin to that of *ruri*, and *rure.*

Is

25867

Is domi *neuer read with any other genitiue caſe, except* meæ, tuæ, &c. *as* Lilly *affirmes?*

Yes: it is read with other poſſeſſiues alſo: we may ſay, *Domi ſuburbanæ, regiæ, paternæ*, as well as *Domi meæ, &c.*

Of verbes Impersonall.

In thoſe clauſes, vt videre eſt, vt legere eſt apud Ariſtotelem. Neq; eſt te fallere cuiquam, Virg. *How comes it to paſſe that* eſt *is put for* licet?

It is an imitation of the Greeks, who put ἔστι and ἐνι for ἔξεστι, *licet*. ſo *Chryſoſt.* οὐ χρημάτων τιὼ ζημίαν πάλιν ἔνι (vel ἔστι) λαβεῖν.

Of Participles.

Are all participles changed not nounes, when they ceaſe to ſignifie Time?

So *Lilly* teacheth vs in his Grammar.

Why

Why then doth hee in his Syntaxis put downe, that exoſus, peroſus, *are conſtrued with an accuſatiue caſe, when they ſignifie actiuely; and a datiue when they ſignifie paſſiuely; and* Pertæſus *with an accuſatiue: Why are* Natus, prognatus, &c. *ſaid to be conſtrued with an ablatiue caſe as participles, when as none of theſe doe ſignifie Time any more then* homo laudatus, *or* puer amandus?

It may be thoſe two rules of *exoſus, peroſus, &c.* and *natus, &c.* are exceptions from that generall rule placed before them, *viz. Participiorum voces cum fiunt nomina, &c.* Participles when they are made nounes require a genitiue caſe: and they are made nounes foure wayes: firſt, when they gouerne not the ſame caſe that the verbes doe that they come of. Secondly, when they are compounded with prepoſitions that their verbs cannot be compounded with. Thirdly, when they are compared. Fourthly, when they leaue of

to

25867

to signifie difference of Time: in this respect *exosus, perosus, &c.* and *natus, &c.* it may bee are excepted from the precedent generall rule.

It may be so: but this is onely a coniecture to saue Lillies *credit.*

Indeede I must needes confesse that *Lilly* is not so distinct, punctuall, and exact as he should bee, but wee must make the best of him, till some other more Grammarian shall compose vs a better Grammar: and here I will adde this also, that that generall of participials gouerning a genitiue, is not to be vnderstood of any participials in *Dus*, or *Tus*, for they gouerne a datiue case: as, *Heros celebrandus omnibus poetis. Hoc est notum lippis & tonsoribus.*

The construction of Aduerbs.

Doth contrà, *being put without case, and so becomming an aduerbe onely, retaine and not augment the signifi-*

nification which it had, being a preposition, as other prepositions doe, coram, post, clam, &c.

No: for it doth not onely signifie opposition, as, *si homo est ridere potest, & contrà, si non est homo ridere non potest*, but reciprocation, conuersion, or alternation: as, *si ridere potest est homo, & contrà, si est homo potest ridere*, where *contrà* is equiualent to *vicissim*, or *vicissim retro*: as also in this of *Terence*: *In eo oblecto me solùm, & carum ille vt item contrà me habeat facio sedulo*: & Virg. Æneid. 1. *Æolus hæc contrà*: where *Æolus* in his speech doth not contradict, but assent to *Iuno*.

May not an Aduerbe, as well as an Adiectiue put partitiuely, gouerne a genitiue case?

Yes: as for example. *Manuum fortiùs se habet dextra. Omnium planetarum sol splendet lucidissimè.*

Is not the aduerbe Parum *sometimes added very elegantly to an adiectiue, and sometimes to a substantiue?*

Yes:

25867

Yes: as *Cic. ad Att. Vide ne dum pudet te parum optimatem esse, parùm diligenter quod optimum est eligas.* Quint. Inst. l. 5. *Mollis, & parum vici signa.* Scal. in Exerc. *Parum Philosophi, parum Physici. Minus, vel parum firma fuit valetudine.*

In those examples: Castra propiùs vrbem mouentur; *and,* Proximè Hispaniam sunt Mauri, *are,* Propiùs, *and* Proximè, *properly aduerbs, gouerning an accusatiue case?*

I thinke not: they rather seeme to be prepositions compared gouerning an accus. as the originall word, or theame *Prope* doth. *Propiùs* cannot bee deriued of *propior* in this Syntaxis; for wee finde in *Liuie, propior vero propiùs vero,* and *propior* is the comparatiue of *propis*, an absolute word, as *prior* of *pris.* So *Goclen. Problem. Gram. l. 3. p. 145.*

May not an Aduerbe deriued of an Adiectiue which gouerneth an Accusatiue case with a Preposition, gouerne the same case?

Yes: as for example. *Poeta si apposite*

posito ad delectationem, Orator ad fidem Philosophus ad vitam dicat, impleſſe munus ſuum videntur. Iuſt. Lipſius.

In that clauſe of the fable of Eſops *Cocke*, granum hordei mallem omnibus gemmis; *why is* gemmis *the ablatiue caſe?*

It is the ablatiue caſe by reaſon of the word *magis*, which lyeth ſecretly couched in the word *mallem*, which may bee reſolued into *magis vellem*.

Are not ſometimes nounes put for aduerbs, & contrà?

Yes: firſt, Nounes put for Aduerbes. *Nullus pro Non*, by the figure called *Antemeria*. *Philotimus nullus venit.* Cic. *Quærit ex proximo vicino num feriæ quædam piſcatorum eſſent, quod eos nullos videret.* Idem. *Etſi nullius diceris.* Terent. *At tu dolebis cum rogaberis nulla.* Catullus. This is an elegant kinde of expreſſion. *Nemo pro Non.* Tac. 4. Ann. *Ferrum, & cædes quonam modo occultaretur nemo reperiebat.*

Vox hominem ſonat. i. humaniter. Virg. *Viuunt Bacchanalia*. i. Bacchanaliter. Item vide *Linac. de Emend. ſtruct. Lat. l. 2. p. 94.*

Multus

25867

Multus pro multum. Multus in libris. In opere multus. Saluſt. *Totus pro totaliter. Totus diſpliceo mihi.* Ter. *Totus eſt alienus à Phyſicis.* Cicer. *Plurimus pro plurimùm. In toto plurimus orbe lègor.*

Secondly, Aduerbs put for nounes. *Satis vir, pro magnanimo.* Senec. *Pluſquam viri, pro virorum partes excedentibus. Parum fides, pro parna.* Plaut.

In thoſe examples. Multò aliter, paulo ſecus, longe ſecus: *are* multò, paulò, longè, *ablatiue caſes?*

Lilly did ill to ſurmiſe ſo; that rule is altogether ſuperfluous; in like manner hee was deceiued before, when in the rules of Adiectiues, he affirmed, that in that example, *Quantò doctior es, tantò te geras ſubmiſſius; quantò*, and *tantò*, were of the ablatiue caſe, whereas they are aduerbs.

May not the forme, or manner of a thing, bee put after an aduerbe in the ablatiue caſe, as well as after an adiectiue?

Yes:

Yes: as, *agit fortiter verbis, factis ignauè.*

Of Coniunctions.

In those Clauses of Plautus *and Terence.* Absque hoc esset, absque eo foret; *how come the verbes to bee of the subiunctiue moode?*

By reason of the particle *si* vnderstood, which is to bee supplyed, to make perfect construction.

After what verbes are those particles vsed, quod, vt, ne.

After these, and the like: for we say, *Puto quod, Iubeo vt, Metuo ne.*

Doe ac, *and* atque, *alwayes come before in a clause?*

Alwayes, except in composition: as, *simulac, simulatq;* after the greeke manner, ἅμα ὡς.

Doth not a coniunction sometimes gouerne a case as a noune?

Yes: as *Virg. Illius ergô Venimus: Amoris, Honoris, Virtutis ergô.*

25867

Of Prepositions.

Is not procul, *when it is construed with Case, a Preposition?*

Some learned men thinke so: it is read with and accusatiue or ablatiue case; as in *Curtius. Procul vrbem.* in *Liuie, Locus procul muros*; and in the same Authors: *Procul muro. Procul mari. Procul discordibus armis.* Virg.

Are not sometimes prepositions put before other prepositions?

Yes: as, *Vsq; sub obscurum noctis. Vsq; ex Æthiopia. De Quinto fratre nuntij nobis tristes venerant ex ante diem Nonarum Iuniarum vsq; ad Pridie Calend. Septemb.* The titles of chapters amongst the Ciuilians are. *De in ius vocando. De in diem addictione*: and, *Gell.* 1. 10. *In de Analogia libro scriptum est.*

Is not a preposition sometimes put for a coniunction, and an aduerbe for a preposition?

Yes: first, a preposition is put for a conjunction in *Saluſt. Praeter re-*

rum

rum capitalium condemnatis : prater for *praterquam.*

Secondly, an aduerbe for a prepoſition in *Virg. Æn. 7. Tali intus templo diuum, patriaque latinus ſede ſedens. vide Linac. de Emend. ſtruct. Lat. Ser. l. 1. p. 109.*

Is not a coniunction ſometimes put in the place of a pronoune with a prepoſition?

Yes: as, *A me vero ita diligitur, vt tibi vni concedam praterea nemini* .i. *prater te. Cic. Eundem ab hoſtibus metui, praterea neminem* i. *prater eum. Idem.*

Of an Interiection.

In this ſentence; Egregium vero Philoſophum qui inter ſolem, & ignem quid intereſſet parum curauit intelligere: *why is* Egregium Philoſophum *the* accuſatiue caſe?

Becauſe therein there is an ellipſis of the interiection *O.*

What interiections gouerne an accuſatiue caſe, beſides thoſe expreſſed in Lillies *Syntaxe?*

Animadversions upon

The [illegible] sayes, *Elige conditionem horum temporum.* Cic. *Hem* being an Ironicall interiection; as, *Hem astutias.* Ter. O subtile deuise *Apage te.* Ter. *Apage istiusmodi salutem.* Plaut.

Are all things that are written by the ancient Authors to be exactly examined and censured according to rule?

No: for some had faults which of set purpose they loued & defended as *Tantus amor est ei ornamentis dicendi, maximè in eloquentia, cum quibusdam certis, & vt vitia quædam sint eligant, & ament:* there is so great error in all studies, especially in eloquence, the rule of which [illegible] time, in so much as [illegible] know and affect their [illegible] Seneca: *Verbis [illegible] bus vsus est Na[illegible] uit vitia sua,* [illegible] was somewhat [illegible] in the vse of some [illegible] fes; wherein, he was [illegible] the fault, but liked [illegible] say that a Mole became not a face

* Lib. 2. Contr. 20 * Vide Alber. Gentil. lect. Virg. l. 2. c. 1 & Cerdam ad 1. Georg. versum. --O quæ me gelidis in vallibus, Hemi.

25867

STC 25867 Animadversions, 1625

Before it was taken apart and bound (by Robert Lunow) this volume was stabbed and stitched in what may have been the original plain vellum. The collation (made while the book was in sheets) was as follows:

$A^{8}(-A1)$ B-I^{8} K1,K2.

A1 was represented by a small stub, still visible. All pairs of leaves were conjugate.

27 De 60 Hets

25867